The Forum.

APRIL, 1892.

A REVIEW OF MY OPINIONS.

I SUPPOSE that each man has some special powers and gifts, and that the particular direction which those powers and gifts take in each man's case is a good deal fixed by his general surroundings, by his teachers, by his friends, by the books he reads, by a thousand mere accidents of life over which he may have no control. These things may affect him in different ways. I believe that what a man is, is always largely due to his home surroundings. But they do not always affect him in the same way. One man accepts the tradition of the elders without doubt, or, if he has any doubt, he stifles the doubt. A man of another turn of mind throws aside the tradition of the elders, simply because it is the tradition of the elders. Both act unreasonably; but each acts after his kind. The tradition affects both of them, though in opposite ways.

No such tradition ever came to me in any strong shape. The inherited opinions and feelings of a long line of forefathers must have an effect one way or another; so must the personal opinions and personal character of an immediate parent of any mark. I never had the advantage or disadvantage of either. My parents died in my early childhood; my bringers-up were two generations older than myself. I suspect that this has made my tastes, memories, feelings, and ways of looking at things a little older than those of most men of my time. I was used in childhood and youth to the talk of those with whom the French Revolution was an event of youth and the American War of Independence an event of childhood. The Declaration of Independ-

Copyright, 1891, by the Forum Publishing Company.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ence was put forth forty-seven years before my birth. I have a grandson who stands at about the same distance from Catholic Emancipation. I suspect that Catholic Emancipation will seem to him through life a more distant event than the Declaration of Independence seems to me.

I suspect also that living mainly with people a great deal older than one's self, as it helps to bring the past somewhat nearer to one, helps also to make one take an early interest in the present; and this, though the persons who exert the influence may be persons of no mark or position, with only an average knowledge of what is going on. Certain it is that I was as a child deeply impressed by many public events and took a keen interest in them, while it strikes me that children in general are not commonly impressed in the same way by the same kind of events in their time. I was, so to speak, introduced both to the present and to the past very early. It was not perhaps done in a very intelligent way; but it was done in some way. I certainly have not kept the impressions of my earliest days, which were for the most part strongly Tory. But I am not sure that it is a bad thing to have been a Tory in childhood. I have the dimmest remembrance of Catholic Emancipation as something very dreadful. But I can remember when George the Fourth was king; I remember the coming in of Lord Grey's ministry in 1830; I vividly remember the great Reform Bill; most vividly of all do I remember the local parliamentary elections in the years 1830, 1831, and 1832. I was very eager then, at the age of from seven to nine years, on behalf of the candidates whom, for the past forty years and more, I should have looked on as the wrong ones. All this I took in from my elders; but I took it in with a warmth of my own. And I went off into regions of my own choosing.

I took a very early fancy to foreign politics. The French Revolution of 1830 was the first foreign event which deeply struck me. And from France I went on to dabble in the affairs of Spain and Portugal. Of course I was everywhere on the wrong side, though I am not sure that in Spain it was wholly the wrong side. The cause of Don Carlos came most clearly home to me as the assertion of the local rights of Navarre and the Basque Provinces. I must, without knowing it, have been something of a Home Ruler already. Of course I really knew nothing about foreign politics; but I learned one piece of knowledge that I have kept. I learned boundaries. I used an atlas, Wilkinson's, which showed the map of Europe as it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had been before the French revolutionary wars and as it was at the actual time. I was never tired of studying these maps, of comparing and copying them. And from that process I got first of all to feel a dislike for the power of Austria. The reason perhaps was not a very sound one.

The old map showed Germany and Hungary with a marked boundary between them. In the new map all Hungary and a great piece of Germany—as also a great piece of Italy—had gone to make up what seemed to me a new thing called "Austria." This I did not like. I knew nothing of the history of the empire as yet, or I might have liked it still less. I ought perhaps to explain that the difference between the old and the new maps, though it implied a real change in the distribution of power, did not imply so great a change as I thought. The maps were affected by the difficulty which affected all who were called on to make maps of central Europe down to the changes of 1866. The new map and the old were made on different principles. The old map showed the boundary of the empire as a whole, without marking the dominions of its several princes. Austria, therefore, lying wholly within Germany, was not marked at all. The name "Prussia" marked the kingdom of Prussia only, not Brandenburg and the other lands within the empire. The new map did not mark the boundary of the confederation, but it showed the territories of its chief princes, both within and without the confederation, as wholes. "Austria" thus came into being, and "Prussia" received a vast enlargement. I did not clearly take in that, though "Austria" was marked in the new map and not in the old; yet, in the old state of things no less than in the new, an Austrian prince ruled alike over Hungary and over a large part of Germany. That that prince had once been emperor-elect of the Romans and had ceased to be so, I did not yet know. But though I certainly could not remember the first use of the words "Empire of Austria," I knew perfectly well that for twelve years (1823–1835) I walked on the earth along with the first man who ever used them. In later days I have sometimes startled people by saying that I was for twelve years contemporary with a man who had been emperor.

Thus I was brought up a Tory in home politics, but I began very early to make an eclectic creed for myself in politics beyond the sea. I think that Wilkinson's atlas has affected me for life. And other things kept me from the beginning away from the received Tory creed in foreign matters. The Tory creed was not then exactly what it is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

now. It did not imply the same fierce hatred of Russia or the same romantic love of the Turk. The Turk was assumed as an existing institution the Greeks, Servians, and Bulgarians were not yet heard of—and was a little looked down on as being taken up by Whigs and Radicals; still, here was the great fact that the last victory of the British arms had been won over the Turk and in concert with the Russian. Tory as was my bringing-up, I was not taught to look on the battle of Navarino as an untoward event. I do not exactly remember the battle—I was not quite so precocious as that; but I do remember when it was talked about as a not very distant event, and when it was talked of as a thing to be proud of. I have a very dim notion that there was already a feeling afloat the other way; but the fight of Navarino always came to my childish ears as something honorable. And I was most likely further impressed by seeing a panorama of the battle which was carried about the country. From that day to this I have never forgotten the last blow that my country struck for righteousness. England has since then intervened for righteousness; but Mr. Gladstone delivered Thessaly and made the Turk give up Dalcigno without striking a blow. Since then Greece, her rights and wrongs—to grow in after days into the rights and wrongs of all south-eastern Europe—have never been out of my thoughts. I remember, while still very young, lighting in some book or newspaper on a doctrine which has often been repeated since, the doctrine that the power of the Turk was something needful to be maintained in the interest of England or of all Europe. This saying came upon me as a strange paradox. How could it be for the interest of England and of Europe to prolong the oppression of European and Christian people at the hands of barbarian and infidel masters? And I have not yet found the diplomatist or the writer of leading articles who has been able to answer the question.

I must confess, I believe, that for a very short time, when I first began to learn something of the older days and the older tongue of Greece, such knowledge had the not uncommon effect of lessening my zeal for Greece as she stood in my own day. But if so, it was for a very short time. I soon learned that the whole tale of Greece was one tale; I presently learned that the tale of Greece was but one part of a still greater tale. I think I may say that I have been a philhellene for fifty years. For forty years I have worked, as a private man could work, for Greece and the other enslaved lands. That the liberated lands know that they have had at least the good-will of one pri-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vate Englishman, that they have valued that good-will at a higher rate doubtless than it was worth, have been among the things which have most cheered me in my whole life.

Another very early impression has, I think, got twined in with the philhellenic impression. I do not know whether any one in the United States knows the name of Thomas Attwood of Birmingham. In his own island it seems to be so wholly forgotten that it finds no place in the dictionary of national biography. Yet sixty years ago he was a power in the land. The Birmingham of his day was not what Birmingham is now, but it was already a great and important town, though a town without parliamentary representation or municipal constitution. In that town Thomas Attwood, a local banker, wielded a power more like that of a Greek demagogue—I use the word in the Greek and not in the vulgar sense—than has often been seen in later times. Under some circumstances he might, if he had had the will, have grown from demagogue into tyrant. As it was, there is no doubt that the Birmingham "Political Union," which he founded, had no small share in carrying the great Reform Bill of 1832. He was one of the first representatives of Birmingham in the Parliament of that year, but in the House of Commons he made no mark; he afterwards withdrew from public life and sank out of notice. But for several years of my childhood he was a very important person. He was my uncle by marriage, and as a child I knew him very well. Of course I was taught to believe that his radical goings-on were not at all the right thing; but I believe that he influenced me in one way. It was the time of the first revolt and reconquest of the kingdom of Poland, sixty years back. Attwood was almost as zealous for Poland as he was for parliamentary reform; and that side of him was allowed to affect me. I took great interest in Poland, and, when I had to choose a prize book, I chose a History of Poland—Dunham's in Lardner's Cyclopedia. Large parts of it I know by heart now.

It seems strange to me now that I knew my Polish kings before I knew my emperors. When I knew my Polish history pretty fairly, the necessary references in Dunham's book to the affairs of the empire used to puzzle me. I believe my Polish zeal grew cold like my Greek zeal. It did not fit in with my Tory theories. It was then the Tories whom Whigs and Radicals used to charge with cringing to Russia, and my Polish history itself taught me that both Poles and Russians were very much like other people. Each nation, I learned, had done the other a shrewd turn whenever it had the chance. And I

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

always had the advantage of knowing my boundaries, that is, of knowing that it was Prussia and Austria, not Russia, which swallowed up the true Poland in 1772–1795. Still, I felt a good deal of interest for the Poles at the time of the last revolt, in 1863. As I came to know the Slavonic as well as the Greek side of south-eastern matters, my old Polish interest easily merged in a general Slavonic interest. And that after all is only part of something much wider, of a zeal for right against wrong, for nations against their foreign masters.

Am I to set it down as a gain or a loss in my life that I never was at a public school? I feel that it has been in some things a loss, perhaps not now, but certainly when I was younger. But I suspect that it has been on the whole a gain. I think I am the more independent for it. There is a certain superstitious feeling about public schools, a certain wonderful bowing down to head-masters, which I feel that I am better without. And would Harrow or Eton in 1836 or 1837 have set me to read the book which I was set to read in my private school? That book was W. C. Taylor's "History of the Overthrow of the Roman Empire and the Foundation of the Principal European States." The book is utterly superseded and forgotten; I have not looked at it for years, and I have no doubt it is far below the standard of 1892. But from that book, coming to it with all the freshness of a boy's first real power of understanding, I learned things better worth knowing than anything that I could have picked up at Eton or Harrow. I had already some dim notion of a western empire; from Taylor's book I first learned that there was an eastern empire. I learned also what Saracens were; I learned that there were Sassanian kings of Persia, Bulgarians also, and many things that have been good for me throughout life. I did not read Gibbon till a good many years later; and I believe that I took in many of these things in a better way through coming on them first in the inferior writer.

My not being at a public school has, I have no doubt, strengthened my love of my university and my college. In my time the head-masters had not had everything their own way. It was possible to enter Oxford before the age of nineteen; it was nothing wonderful to get a scholarship before eighteen or even earlier still. And to be scholar and fellow of Trinity from 1841 to 1847 was something to be. It was indeed a circle to look back to of which fifty years ago I was chosen a member, a circle of which a man is much to be blamed if he is not wiser and nobler for having been one. But love of the founda-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion, the feeling of membership, of brotherhood, in an ancient and honorable body, the feeling of full possession in one's college as a home, the feeling of personal nearness to a benefactor of past times, all that gathers round the scholarship that was something worthier than a mere prize, the fellowship that was something worthier than a crammer's wages—all this, I hope, has not even yet utterly vanished; but, under the hands of one reforming commission after another, such feelings have undoubtedly greatly weakened in the Oxford to which I have come back. In the unreformed university, the unreformed college in which I had the happiness to spend my youth, we had time to learn something, because we were not always being taught. We were not kept through our whole time, vexed by examination after examination, examined in this subject one term, in that subject the next term, all ingeniously combined for the better forgetting of one thing before the next was taken in. We had one examination, and a searching one, the successful passing of which could not seem to any but a fool to be the goal of study, but which, by the reading it required, gave a man the best possible start for study in several branches of knowledge. In that examination I failed; that is, I was in the second class and not in the first. It has very seldom since come into my head to think whether I was first, second, third, or fourth; I have never at any moment of my life forgotten that I was once a scholar and fellow of Trinity.

Happy in most things as was my scholar's life, there was still the drawback of having to read for an examination. I suppose examinations cannot be got rid of, I suppose they are necessary evils; but they certainly are evils. Reading for an examination, even if it be real reading and not taking in tips from a crammer, is not what reading should be. A lower motive comes in; it is not simply reading for the sake of knowledge. To me the examination was always a mere bugbear, something that hindered real work. I shall never forget my joy when the examination was over; one of my first thoughts was, "Now I can really begin to read." And in October, 1845, I did begin to read. I began by reading my Herodotus over again. That was the beginning of a course which in February, 1892, is not ended. Truly, the more one learns the more one finds one has to learn.

And yet I must give a very high place to some parts of my reading for the Oxford schools. Aristotle's "Ethics" was then—I believe it still is—an *essential* subject, what to a schoolmaster, birch in hand, it seems to come more naturally to call a *compulsory* subject. Left to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

myself, I should perhaps never have read the "Ethics"; I should certainly not have read them as I did read them. I should most likely have looked to see what historical facts I could get out of the book, and not much more. But having to read the book thoroughly, I felt that I drew from it a new power, a power of discerning likenesses and unlikenesses, of distinguishing real and false analogies, which I had not before, and which has helped me ever since. I have written the "History of the Norman Conquest," I am writing the "History of Sicily," all the better for having been made to read about *μεγαλοψυχία* and *ἐπιχαιρεκακία*. And to Aristotle I must add Butler; him I believe the march of reform has swept away, hardly to the clearing of men's minds. I do not so much mean the "Analogy" as the wonderful "Sermons." From the "Sermons on Human Nature" one learns, and one does not straightway forget, what manner of man one is. And I may add the three books of Euclid that I took in for my little-go—though to be sure I had learned, though I have since forgotten, a little more of mathematics than I knew before I came to Oxford. Whenever I hear a man sneer at mathematics, I suspect him of having been plucked in them. I do not expect such a man to see very clearly what is proof and what is not. And some American reader may be pleased when I tell him that by the help of the three books that I took up at little-go I found my way about the streets and avenues of Washington and New York.

To these influences at the time of my being at Oxford and shortly after I must add the influence of two great writers, both living at the time, but neither of whom I ever spoke to, one of whom I never saw. These were Arnold and Lord Macaulay. To me Arnold is not the famous schoolmaster, in which character he has had worshippers enough. Arnold of Rugby was nothing to me. All that I learned from him I should have learned just as well, perhaps better, if he had stayed at Laleham or at Oriel. But in his character of editor of Thucydides and author of the "History of Rome," there is no man from whom I learned more. It was not so much particular facts or particular views that I learned from him as something much greater. I learned from him how to use any facts or any views. I learned from him what history was. I learned from him the truth of the unity of history. I learned from him the folly of the wretched distinctions "ancient" and "modern" and what-not, which make true historic learning almost hopeless. As to Lord Macaulay—the "History of England" did not come out till I had left Oxford, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I doubt if I read the "Essays" till about the same time; but of the "Lays of Ancient Rome"—I believe the critics of the grand style call them "pinchbeck," which I fancy is meant to be scornful—I can only say that they are still ringing in my ears with a note as fresh as they had fifty years back. I have said them over on their own ground; I have proved the truth of every epithet; and now, with the Sicilian deeds of Pyrrhus as my day's work, it is the notes of the "Prophecy of Capys" which come first home to me at the thought of the "Red King" and his bold Epirotes. Still, the "Lays" are play-work beside the "History."

I am told that the matchless writing of Macaulay is nowadays jeered at. I am not sure whether it is allowed to be "style"; I am not sure whether it is allowed to be "literature." I have now and then made some efforts to find out what "style" and "literature" are. I find that they are something very different from Macaulay, something very different from Arnold, something, I might go on to say, very different from Gibbon. I have tried the writings of a notable "stylist," the great living model, I am told, of style. Now, did anybody ever have to read over a sentence of Macaulay or of Arnold, or even of the artificial Gibbon, a second time simply in order to find out its meaning? But I found that in my "stylist" a plain man could not make out the meaning of a single sentence without greater pains than are needed to follow an imperfectly known foreign language. A story seemed to be told; but there was no making out whether the story was meant to be fact or fiction. I will not say that I have imitated Macaulay's style, because I gather from what I saw of my "stylist" that Macaulay has no "style." I have not consciously imitated his manner of writing; that is, I have not tried to write like him. Yet Macaulay's manner of writing has been in the highest measure an influence with me. I have learned from him to say what I mean and to mean what I say—to cut my sentences short—not to be afraid of repeating the same word, not to talk about "the former" and "the latter," but to call men and things whatever they are. I have learned from him to say what I have to say in the purest, the clearest, the strongest, aye, and the most rhythmical English that I can muster. If my "stylist" is "style" and Lord Macaulay is not "style," a man who wishes to be understood will say something more than "*sæpe stylum vertas*"; he will say good-by to "style" and stick to plain English.

One more experience from my Oxford days. While I was a bachelor of arts, the subject given one year for the English essay was "The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Effects of the Norman Conquest." The Norman conquest was a subject that I had been thinking about ever since I could think at all. I wrote for the prize; I had the good luck not to get it. Had I got it, I might have been tempted to think that I knew all about the matter; as it was, I went on and learned something about it.

I am not writing an autobiography; I do not fancy that that is wished. But there are some features of my life which I think come under the head required. I certainly count as important whatever has tended in me to independence of thought. Perhaps the kind of life that I have mainly led may have helped to that end. I belong to no profession; I can hardly be said to belong to any class. But I have points of contact with several classes. At once a professor in Oxford and a justice of the peace in Somerset, I do not feel that I am exactly a country gentleman; still less do I feel that I am exactly an Oxford don; I suppose I am not a "literary man," because I have never lived by writing; I suppose I am not a political character, because I have never sat in Parliament. But I feel that I have enough in common with all these classes and with other classes as well to understand all of them, without exactly belonging to any of them.

I fancy that these things have helped to make me think for myself. As Gibbon wrote his history the better for having served in the Hampshire militia, I believe that I can write mine the better for having sat at quarter-session at Wells and Taunton, for having been a member of the hebdomadal council at Oxford, for having gone through an unsuccessful parliamentary contest for Mid-Somerset. I may have lost something by not living in London, by distinctly avoiding London. In London I might have known some men whom I have not known. But I am sure that the purely London man is the narrowest of all men, the most likely blindly to respect the formula of his party or his set. And I am sure that I should not have gained by staying here in Oxford from the time I took my degree till now. Six-and-thirty years of country life, from leaving Oxford in 1848 to coming back to it in 1884, have, I think, not been bad for me. And now that I have to spend half the year among walls and houses, there is no bit of Greek that comes oftener into my thoughts than this, which I can apply to myself,

στυγῶν μὲν ἄστυ, τὸν δ' ἐμὸν δῆμον ποθῶν.

Some of my American friends have been good enough to write up as a motto a saying which fell from me in some speech or lecture: "History is past politics; politics are present history." Like other

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

men, I have had my critics, fair and unfair. Of the unfair I will not now speak; but there is a class that mean to be fair who greatly amuse me. How much better am I employed when I am dealing with this and that remote point of history than when I am speaking against the dear Turk or the dear Jew. Or the critic will graciously allow that I know something of past events, although, he sorrowfully adds, I go so very far wrong about the events of my own time. When Louis-Philippe was king of the French, it was said that his supporters formed two classes, the *parceques* and the *quoiques*. One party said, "*Louis-Philippe est roi, parcequ'il est Bourbon.*" The other party said, "*Louis-Philippe est roi, quoiqu'il est Bourbon.*" I think my friends at Johns Hopkins, if nowhere else, will understand me when I say that the relation between my studies of past life and my views of present times is not a matter of *quoique*, but of *parceque*. They will understand that my political and my historical growth have gone hand in hand. I gradually changed the Tory creed of my childhood and youth as I came to know more both of past and of present things. I changed that creed by the instructive process of carrying it out to its logical results, and then seeing that those logical results would not hold either in theory or practice. For a few years I believed very wonderful things indeed; I was a great deal more Tory than the teaching of my childhood. I believe that this is a wholesome stage to have gone through. Every Liberal doctrine that I have accepted, I have accepted by a process of thought. Mr. Gladstone is my leader in the sense of a captain; he is not my leader in the sense of a teacher.

In most of the political matters to which I have given any thought at all—not being in Parliament, I do not feel bound to give thought to every political matter—I have come to my own conclusions first; and I have had the pleasure of seeing the practical men come to the same conclusions later. This has been above all the case with the political matter which comes most home to me, that with regard to which I feel that history and politics are most truly one. I have for years tried to do what I could for truth and right everywhere, in all times and in all places. I see that the whole history of Europe forms the record of one long struggle, a struggle of which the earliest known phases will be found in the opening chapters of Herodotus, while the latest as yet will be found in the morning's telegrams. It was the present Lord Derby who, in a sneering fit, first spoke, as far as I know, of "the eternal

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Eastern question." Lord Derby simply meant that to him it was a weariness and a nuisance to hear of the wrongs of oppressed nations which he had made up his mind to leave in the jaws of their oppressors. But in so saying, Lord Derby stumbled on the happiest epithet that man ever lighted on. The "Eastern question" is indeed "eternal"; it was, in the cant of diplomatists, "awaiting its solution" at the first beginnings of recorded history; it is "awaiting its solution" still. That "solution" cannot come as long as a single rood of European and Christian soil is left in the grasp of barbarian intruders. The strife is indeed eternal. It is the strife between light and darkness, between freedom and bondage; it is the strife between the West and the East, between Europe and Asia, the strife which in its earliest days took the shape of the strife between Greek and barbarian, the strife which, for the last twelve centuries, has been sharpened to its keenest as the strife between Christendom and Islam.

The tale is the same in all ages, from the Platæan who gave his life for right at Marathon to the Russian who gave his life for right at Plevna. There were medizing Greeks in one age; there are friends of the Turk in another. There was a Trachinian who sold himself to lead the Persian over the hill to Thermopylæ; there was an Englishman who sold himself to lead the barbarian fleet against the struggling patriots of Crete. There was a Peace of Antalkidas which handed over the Greeks of Asia to the Great King; there was a treaty of Berlin which, when Macedonia had been set free by the Russian sword, thrust it back once more under the heel of the faithless Ottoman. Yes, history is past politics, politics is present history; no line can be drawn between them; no imaginary barrier of "ancient" and "modern" can part them asunder. The same laws which apply to the one apply also to the other. Thankful am I indeed that the influence which was already at work when I asked my childish question how it could be a good thing for my country that wrong should be done in another country has never died out of me for a moment.

On this head I have one more word to say. I know that there are many in this hemisphere, there may be some in another, to whom an Englishman who can in any case speak well of Russia seems a strange being, perhaps a traitor. I cannot, specially remembering how feeling on this matter has turned round within my own memory, see why Russia should be treated either as something evil in itself or as the natural enemy of England. To me it seems that Russia and its rulers are simply like any other nation and its rulers, capable

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of righteous action at one moment and of unrighteous action at another. I am for the oppressed everywhere, whoever may be the oppressor. I am for reasonable national aspirations everywhere, even when there is no actual oppression. As I am for justice to Ireland, for justice to Bohemia, I am no less for justice to Finland. If Alexander the Third is really minded to destroy the noble work of his father and his great-uncle in his constitutional Grand Duchy, he is simply all the worse for being the unworthy representative of such predecessors. It is those who have dared to applaud the good deeds of one Russian autocrat who have the best right to speak against any possible evil deeds of another.

I dare say I might say more; but I feel that I have said enough for the purpose for which I have been asked to say anything. It is that chance proverb of mine which the historical students of Johns Hopkins have honored me by setting up over their library, it is by the application which I have made of it both to the events of the remotest times and to the events which I have seen happen in the course of sixty-nine years, that I would fain have my life and my writings judged.

EDWARD A. FREEMAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A CAMPAIGN FOR A PRINCIPLE.

THE weakness of the Democratic party at the close of the Civil War compelled it to rely for a return to popular favor more upon the misdeeds and demerits of its opponents than upon positive merits of its own. Anxious to draw recruits to its wasted ranks, it naturally had recourse, both in its platforms and in its campaigns, to vigorous arraignments of the party in power rather than to clear and explicit statements of its own purposes and principles. Yet it would be unfair to charge it with any concealment of its temper and attitude as to the chief controversies of the day. It was, as it ever had been, a national party, and exerted itself at all times to assuage the spirit of sectionalism. It was, as ever, a States' rights party, and did all that it could to revive the drooping cause of local self-government and to resist the centripetal forces let loose by the war. It was, as ever, regardful of the burdens of the people, and fought against extravagance in public expenditure. These were great and timely services, and they were wisely and well rendered by the party under the lead of Hendricks, Thurman, and Bayard. But any party condemned to remain long in opposition, if it does not actually dissolve, loses something of the boldness and initiative that belong to and are developed by responsibility and action. It is too apt to content itself with censure and criticism, to become lax, if not ambiguous, in its own expressions of faith, welcoming to its ranks all who are willing to co-operate in war upon the party in power, without requiring from them the acceptance of any definite principles.

The Whig party, in its day, developed immense enthusiasm among its followers, and had a great and superb array of leaders; but the battles it won were fought upon ambiguous platforms, with ambiguous leaders on whose military prestige it depended for popular strength. Once only in its history did it venture into a presidential campaign with a genuine Whig candidate upon a genuine Whig platform, and then it lost. But what was both prudence and necessity in the first contests after the war ceased to be such when voters began to manifest a weariness of the Republican party and a willingness to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

abandon its ranks if they could know with certainty where such abandonment would take them. As the first principles of the Democratic party fix its position on all fundamental questions, it was more habitual strategy, born of long exclusion from power, than any necessary uncertainty that held it back from taking the unmistakable position on the tariff question which was no less sound policy for itself than frank dealing with the people.

But the rank and file were ready for the word of command; and when that word came from President Cleveland in December, 1887, they marched forth with great enthusiasm for a great cause, and with something of the affirmative and aggressive purpose that had so often led the party to triumph in past generations. The first battle was lost, and lost as much through the lingering vitality of the sectional issue as through the perfect combination of the protected industries. But deeply as they felt the defeat of an administration whose vigor, honesty, and fidelity to Democratic principles well deserved approval from the people, the Democratic hosts lost neither faith nor earnestness in their cause, and went out of power with the buoyant confidence that in its name they would speedily win again permanent control of the Federal government. Everywhere they kept the tariff issue to the front, defined their position more boldly and clearly upon it, made it a theme of constant debate on the hustings, in the press, at the school-house, the post-office, and the village store, until economic discussions got "into the air," and the screamings of the bloody-shirt orator fell upon unheeding and unsympathetic ears.

The first fruits of this policy were gathered in the State elections of 1889. Iowa swung over into the Democratic column; Ohio chose a Democratic governor; Massachusetts was lost by a mere scratch; and New York, which had so grievously disappointed the Democratic hopes in 1888, came back with majorities ranging from ten to twenty thousand on her State officers. These and other victories clearly showed that, in addition to local causes operating in the different States and communities, there was one general and steady force working everywhere for Democratic success.

The Fifty-first Congress, by its partisanship, its extravagance, its tariff and Force Bills, greatly quickened the revolution, and turned what had been a slow and orderly retreat of the Republican column into a disastrous rout, where, in the words of its leader, only those who started early were able to save their baggage. In the State campaigns of 1891 party lines were again restored, but Democratic

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

victories in Iowa, New York, and Massachusetts indicated the unchecked progress of tariff reform. In all this series of notable victories, following immediately upon its defeat in 1888, the Democratic party had won on the simple condition of being true to itself. Every intelligent man who knew the traditional principles of the party knew that, when it came to itself, it must take up the fight for tariff reform as its great cause, and carry that fight to final and permanent victory. As soon as it ceased to be an opportunist, manœuvring for success, and began to speak in sincere and courageous tones, because it was its duty so to speak, it felt not only a kindling of zeal in its own ranks, but had accessions of strength for which it had scarcely hoped. The powerful independent press of the country came to its side, and ardent and enthusiastic friends sprang up in every quarter.

In all this there was nothing strange. In the first triumphs of the Republican party, Martin Van Buren prophesied that as soon as "the perturbations of party names and systems produced by the disturbing subject of slavery" had spent their force, the old lines would be reformed, and "the individuals who now constitute the so-called Republican party" would "revert to their original positions." If the historian who records the prompt and honest acceptance by the South of the results of the war is perplexed to understand how the passions and hatreds of that war could so long serve as political capital for a party, he will see the explanation in the fact that the opponents of the Republican party had not found or had not forced any great national issue sufficient to expel these feelings from the breasts of the people. The habits of a quarter of a century prevented the older men who, Democrats in principle, had joined the Republican party on the slavery question, "from reverting to their original positions," but the sons of the fathers saw no glory or patriotism in fighting for monopoly or the bloody shirt, and, with the great and growing body of Independents, on whom party ties had sat loosely or uncomfortably for years, were glad to enlist in a cause that commanded their approval and was worthy of their highest services.

If in the light of its triumphs for the past three years the Democratic party does not now see where the path of duty and the opportunity of success are alike found, it does not rightly interpret the popular favor that has been bestowed upon it, and does not comprehend the vitality and greatness of the cause in whose name it has been overcoming its enemies. "It so happened," said Mr. Burke, when he was defending the American colonies in the House of Commons, "that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the great contests for freedom in this country were from the earliest times on the question of taxing." And so must they always be, for a just and equal system of taxation is the only foundation of free government. To secure and maintain such a system is the high and never-ending mission of the Democratic party. That party came into existence to uphold the idea, not very old in the world as yet, and nowhere in the world fully acted upon as yet, that all government is the servant of the people, that it should always be under their control, and never in the control or service of privileged classes or favored individuals.

Tariff reform is therefore not only a great issue, it is a cardinal Democratic issue. It means not only the rescue of the government from the service and control of privileged classes and favored individuals, but it involves and carries with it all the other great reforms which unselfish citizens are so anxious to secure, and at times so hopeless of securing, in our politics. It is truly said by Herbert Spencer that every principle has its momentum, and the principle of protection brings with it a brood of evils more incompatible with pure government than are all its unjust money exactions. In the very outset, it teaches that some men have a right to rely on government for success in private business rather than upon their own efforts and merits. Such a doctrine wrests government from the service of all and turns it over to the service of a class. Moreover, it bestows upon government, to use the words of an old Virginia statesman, "the worldly omnipotence that belongs to the power of dealing out wealth and poverty," and thus changes political campaigns from contests for sound principles into battles for private booty. A reform of the tariff must therefore precede any genuine and lasting ballot reform. We may adopt the Australian system, just as in days past we adopted the secret ballot, and for a while baffle the briber and the intimidator; but greed and ingenuity will soon learn the combination, if great plunder is still to be had by rifling the safe. And it is not only the voter who must be shielded from temptation and corrupting influences, but also the law-maker. A permanent lobby is a necessary part of a protective system. "Close the doors this morning," said Senator Beck, when the tariff bill of 1883 was under consideration in Congress, "and there will be found five hundred men in the corridors, in the lobbies, in the committee-rooms, in the reception-room, everywhere, besieging senators and representatives to stand by them and their interests. Promises, flattery, threats—everything is resorted to." Equally strong was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the outcry of Senator Plumb, of Kansas: "The moment it was announced that it [the tariff question] was to be discussed, there came to this city from all quarters of the country scores of men interested in the various industries to be affected by the tariff, who came to counsel, came to advise, came to cajole, and came to threaten, almost, in some cases, I have no doubt."

Tariff reform is likewise the condition of any great and permanent reform of the civil service. Bribery of voters and of party workers is not only by money paid them, but by offices and government positions pledged them. England was not able to get rid of the spoils system in her civil service until she had eliminated protection from her laws. "The decisive part of the contest between patronage and open competition," says Mr. Dorman B. Eaton, in his "History of Civil Service in Great Britain," "was between 1845 and 1855, though the victors did not take possession of the full field until 1870." The principle at the basis of the protective and the spoils systems is identical—the claim to use the power and patronage of government for private favoritism.

And lastly, we are now no longer left in doubt that tariff reform is the essential safeguard of that doctrine that lies so near the Democratic heart, the doctrine of local self-government—the vital breath of our continental, Federal republic. Every one who was not blind discerned the hand that was behind the Force Bill in the last Congress. The experience of Supervisor Davenport might be invoked to draft its crafty network of details, the literary reputation of Mr. Lodge to become sponsor for it in the House, and the affluent learning and high personal character of Mr. Hoar to give it headway in the Senate; but the strong and driving force behind the whole scheme was the great and vigilant combination of our tariff-supported industries. It was an attempt on their part, under a false mask, to get control of the power of government, in perpetuity, without the constantly recurring expense of bribing the voters and the constantly recurring hazard of submitting their bounties to popular elections. For fear its friends in the House would not clearly understand this fact, the New York "Tribune" had the frankness to blurt it out, while the bill was pending there, by saying, "The election bill carries within itself the assurance of future tariff bills by the hundred."

It is thus, because tariff reform, aside from its economic advantages, is the beginning and necessary foundation of other great reforms that tend to elevate American citizenship and to give stability and purity to American institutions, that it has so speedily brought allies to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Democratic camp. These allies are animated by unselfish patriotism. They ask nothing for themselves. Many of them, doubtless enough of them to hold the balance of power in doubtful States, are not yet willing to admit that they "belong" to the Democratic party so that they will follow its flag wherever it may choose to go, but even the "Mugwump," against whom partisans on both sides delight to rail, will almost always be found ready to vote the Democratic ticket, provided the Democratic ticket stands sincerely for Democratic principles.

Should the party now falter in this fight, should it suffer a cause that has given the party so much moral as well as voting strength, that is so great and democratic in itself, and so big with other great reforms, to fall into the background while rival candidates struggle for the presidential nomination, or permit it to be weighted down by other issues, then the party will manifest such a trifling with duty and such a throwing away of great opportunities as to provoke a moral reaction against itself, involving not only disaster, but disaster with merited disgrace. The mere suspicion that all this might happen has already thrown some confusion into its ranks and awakened the most anxious feeling in the country. Yet success still waits upon the discharge of duty, and duty requires two things at its hands in the presidential campaign of 1892: first, the adoption of a clear and unambiguous tariff-reform platform, and a campaign made upon that platform alone, with the exclusion of issues on which the party itself is split and the country undoubtedly against it; secondly, the nomination of candidates whose names and characters shall give the people the unmistakable guaranty that they represent in person all that the platform sets forth in words. If it be said that this is pitching a national campaign upon a single issue, I have already shown that this single issue involves, not remotely, but directly and vitally, almost everything that we understand by good government, and to the enumeration already made must be added the ever-present issue of frugality and honesty in government expenditures.

But the question arises: Who doubts that the Democratic party is loyal to the cause of tariff reform and ready to fight for its success? Why is it necessary to say all this to-day? Because another issue has been made prominent that threatens to divide the party into warring fragments and cause it to squander in internal strife the strength it has been gathering for a great and final contest with protection.

It is idle to deny that, to a great many earnest Democrats and sincere tariff reformers, the silver question presents itself as an issue of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

equal dignity and equal promise of benefit to the people; and we who live in or near what may just now be called the silver zone of the country know something of the earnestness with which the great farmer organization has been induced to take up the cry for free silver, as more important to them just now than a reduction of tariff taxes.

It is not within the purpose of this article to present or consider the arguments *pro* or *con* regarding the free-silver question. The financial question is the weak point in popular government, and unfortunately it presses its way to the front at the very times when the people are least able to deal with it intelligently. Macaulay has said that there is no quackery in medicine, religion, or politics which may not impose even on a powerful mind, when that mind is disordered by pain or fear; and, adapting his words to the condition of the Southern and Western farmers, we may say that they are to-day what their situation has made them, irritable from a sense of distress, and naturally prone to accept remedies that seem to promise speediest relief from the misfortunes with which they are suffering. To men struggling with the burdens of debt no explanation seems so plausible as the artificial scarcity of money, no remedy so simple and speedy as an "abundant and elastic circulating medium" provided by or through the agency of government.

Beyond question the temporary prostration or distress of the great planting and farming interests has been greatly aggravated by the tariff, for it has thrown upon them not only an unjust share of the burdens of government, but also the support of many dependent industries, while it has lessened their means by shutting them off from a profitable exchange of their surplus products. The farmer's great need to-day is less taxes and more markets, a healthy and natural expansion of commerce, which, as Mr. Hamilton said, vivifies and invigorates every channel of industry and makes it flow with greater activity and copiousness. But this sounds like an old song, and the remedy requires time to work it out, while the farmer, like our Republican leaders in the last House, is after immediate "results."

But upon what plea will the most sincere advocate of free coinage within the Democratic ranks justify to himself the forcing upon his party, in the present state of public opinion, and in the coming campaign, an issue that threatens to defeat the party and carry down in one common wreck party, tariff reform, and possibly bi-metallism also? This question is one that addresses itself to-day with unprecedented directness to the Democrats of the South, for to them it is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

something more than a matter of party success or party defeat. The South has now realized what has been her most ardent longing since the war, the obliteration of the sectional issue. For the first time since Appomattox, she sees an issue big enough, national enough, and near enough to the people to cast down the bloody shirt, to the discussion of which her own sons are invited in the most genuine spirit of fraternity on all platforms in the North, and by whose virtue as an antidote to sectionalism one of her ex-soldiers has been raised to the Speaker's chair of the House of Representatives. For the first time since the war, Democrats of the South see their party completely rehabilitated as a national party, bringing to the House of Representatives a majority of members from the North as well as from the South; bringing to the Senate members from Wisconsin, Illinois, and New York; and occupying the Governor's chair in Michigan, Wisconsin, Massachusetts, and Iowa—States, until the last year or two, the very strongholds of Republicanism.

Is the Southern Democracy so satisfied in its own mind that the free coinage of silver is the one great and specific remedy for the distresses real or imagined of the people, that in pursuit of that remedy it is willing to put in peril all these things, to risk all it has slowly and painfully gained in the political contests of twenty-seven years; and this in the face of the warning, expostulation, and pleading for life of so many of their wisest, discreetest, and most sincere Northern brethren, men who for the sake of the South fought many years in political minorities, without hope or prospect of personal advancement? Let the answer to these questions be looked for and made, not in the House or the Senate, chosen months and years ago, but in the coming national convention, made up of representatives fresh from the people, and commissioned by them to see that no detriment is done to the great party whose success in the coming campaign involves the cause of wise and frugal government, a just system of taxation, and in all things, to quote the words of its founder, "the cherishment of the people."

If it be true, as I have assumed, that, notwithstanding the remarkable Democratic victories of the past three years, the fate of this presidential campaign is still in the hands of the independent voter, it may not be amiss to close this article with some review of the present administration, especially as to those matters which chiefly interest such a voter. The country had a right to expect great things from this administration in the way of civil-service reform. It made great pledges,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and it was less subject to temptation than any party had been in the past half-century. When President Cleveland took the office, he found a civil service almost unanimously Republican and almost entirely built up on the spoils system. When President Harrison succeeded, he found his own party still holding the great majority of places in the classified service and a considerable per cent of the places in the unclassified service. Moreover, a Republican Senate had reserved for him almost all the offices that fell vacant after the election in 1888, by refusing to act on Mr. Cleveland's nominations, although it had confirmed almost all the nominations made by President Arthur after the election in 1884. The Republican platform was strong in its civil-service plank; and in his letter of acceptance, President Harrison had added to his hearty indorsement of the platform his own virtual pledge that "in appointments to every grade and department, fitness and not party service should be the essential and discriminating test, and fidelity and efficiency the only sure tenure of office. Only the interest of the public service should suggest removals from office." As a senator criticising Mr. Cleveland, he had "lifted up a hearty prayer that we may never have a President who will not pursue a civil-service policy pure and simple, upon a just basis, allowing men accused to be heard, and deciding against them only on competent proof and fairly," adding, "or for God's sake let us have that other frank and bold, if brutal, method of turning men and women out simply for political opinions."

In the face of this noble prayer and these noble pledges the President turned over the post-office department to the spoilsmen. The railway mail service was looted in the first months of the administration, two-thirds of the presidential post-offices were filled during the first year, and Clarkson's axe ceased to fall among the fourth-class postmasters only when there were no more heads worth decapitating. Nor did any fidelity and efficiency or regard for the interests of the public service save Pearson in New York, Hendrix in Brooklyn, Corse in Boston, Collector Saltonstall and other less conspicuous but equally faithful public servants. The great census bureau also, contrary to recent practice, was given over to patronage, with results that discredited some of its most important work. Over against these abuses, aggravated as they were by the transfer of patronage to local bosses in New York and other States, we may give the administration some credit for the reforms introduced by Secretary Tracy in the navy-yards.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The administration must also accept the responsibility for the McKinley act, for it not only indorsed and approved the bill as considered and passed, but has been at great pains to try to vindicate its operation since it went into effect. That act has carried the doctrine of protection to an extreme never before seriously advocated in this country. It found the treasury embarrassed by a surplus revenue and reduced that revenue by abolishing taxes that went to the government, and by readjusting the terms of partnership in the use of the taxing power between the government and private interests so as to divert a still larger share of their joint income from the former to the latter. It placed the heaviest taxes upon the necessaries of life and the necessaries of labor that any self-governing people ever submitted to, and in its avowed effort to check commerce it aimed a foul blow at the prosperity of the farmer, by demonetizing or debasing through prohibition and heavy fines the only currency—foreign imports—for which he could exchange his surplus products.

It has been proclaimed by its defenders as the most harmonious system of protection ever enacted into law, whereas those who watched the methods of its preparation saw that it was but a vast and voluminous system of class taxation in which private interests were invited and allowed to write their own demands upon a tax-paying people. Its immediate and natural effects have been mitigated by enormous harvests and foiled by these elements of exuberant prosperity with which our country beyond all others is blessed, but it is and will continue as long as it remains on our statute-book an unjust distribution of the burdens of government and of the avails of industry. The scheme of so-called reciprocity incorporated into it is based upon the idea that if other governments insist on making or for fiscal reasons are compelled to make food dear and scarce to their people, we will retaliate on our people by making shoes and sugar and tea and coffee scarcer and dearer to them.

And lastly the Force Bill was as much an administrative measure as a persistent and almost passionate advocacy of such a measure by the President could make it. That bill was not an ordinary remedial statute. It was at cross purposes with the very structure of the State. "He who appoints the judges," said John Adams, "may have what law he pleases"; and if this be true generally, with what undoubted force would it apply to the power of appointing judges of elections! Mr. Jefferson said that the old Federalists when beaten at all other points attempted to retire into the judiciary. The Lodge bill, wit-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tingly or unwittingly, imitated their tactics. It proposed to give a Federal judiciary, composed, with a single exception, of Republican judges, full control through its appointees of elections for representatives in Congress and presidential electors in the States. In order to prevent sporadic cases of fraud in the interest of one or the other party as the case might be, it would have invited or permitted universal and permanent fraud in the interests of one party.

But aside from its partisan purposes and effects, it was an assault on the foundations of free government. The idea from which it sprang and the principle on which it was founded were alike false and vicious. It was, even in its best intentions, very near to that fanaticism that believes it can change the constitution of human society, "undo the work of evolution," and in its own way "remodel human life." It proceeded on the idea that never did, and, happily for us, never can, have any substantial basis: that when two races live commingled in the common citizenship of a State or congressional district, to one of whom the ideas and habits of self-government and the skilful use of political representation has, by the training of two thousand years, become a second nature, while the other has just emerged from slavery, and a little farther back from unspeakable barbarism and ignorance, political supremacy is a mere question of numbers, and election returns may be worked out by the census. Because elections in Southern States and Southern districts failed to follow the color line, as that line is described in the United States census of population, the framers of the Lodge bill drew the conclusive presumption of fraud, and undertook to reconstruct human society, to punish and disfranchise intelligence and leadership and capacity for self-government. And the shadow of the Force Bill has not yet vanished from the land.

The independent voter must still find his congenial home, his appropriate field of duty and of political work, with the Democratic party.

WM. L. WILSON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE DEMOCRATIC REVOLT IN NEW YORK.

THE Democratic party to-day occupies a position of singular and exceptional advantage. Its growth, relative and absolute, has of late years been continuous and remarkable. The decadence of its old enemy has been as conspicuous as its own progress. The old lion of Republicanism, whose roar once filled the land, if not the world, now mildly walks about in quest of food, solicitous for existence, anxious for patronage, without which its life has lost its charms, and roaring, when its voice is heard at all, gently as any sucking dove. Born of sectional difference, nurtured by war and sustained by discord, it never sought to maintain its ascendency by cultivating the gentler arts of harmony. Logically enough, it developed according to the laws of its origin, and was never able to adapt itself to the circumstances of a united and prosperous nation. The South was never in its eyes an integral part of our people. Remission for past misdeeds could not be accorded the late enemies of the Union without the sacrifice of consistency or the abandonment of prejudices too deeply rooted for the surgeon's knife. Its vital principle and power were buried at Appomattox, and while its own momentum, the mistakes of its adversaries, and patronage unscrupulously dispensed still kept it active, its doom was inevitable. Having outlived its usefulness and its dignity, the party of Lincoln, of Seward, of Grant, of Chase passed to the hands of men unworthy to loose the latchet of those great men's shoes. Think, if you can, of Lincoln heading an army of southern carpet-baggers, of Seward in desperation looking to Force Bills for party salvation, and of Grant bullying little Chili in order that the great Republican party might live four years more! Even to a Democrat the spectacle is not one of unmixed satisfaction. His patriotism can derive no comfort from the degradation of his foes, nor can his pride receive satisfaction from a triumph over a diminished enemy.

The Democratic party during the same time developed and grew in the direction of its origin. Beaten, baffled, derided by many years of unsuccessful contest, unrefreshed by official patronage, it is brave

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and defiant as ever. It made many mistakes, its leaders often failed in their duty, it sometimes yielded to temptation for temporary advantage, but throughout it retained its distinctive character as the party of the people; not of this section or that, not of the rich or the strong, not of division or discord, but of the whole people, North and South, East and West. It did not feed old resentments nor aggravate slumbering remnants of former animosities. Appeals to sectional prejudices were a crime in its code as they were of necessity a virtue in the Republican catechism. To wave the bloody trophies of a hideous past before the people as a flag, at every recurring election, could never be consistent with Democratic policy. Its creed was catholic enough to cover the land with a broad mantle of charity. The wrongs, the errors, the sins of the past were buried from its sight, and it was ready to fall upon the neck of the prodigal son, to receive him back into his father's house and let him vie with the other members of the great family of citizens in a common effort to magnify and enrich the country. It therefore remained by excellence the party of the people and the party of patriotism. Discussion may scarcely be had on profitable terms where argument is required to show that union is better than discord, love better than hate, and forgetfulness of a cruel past better than a periodical and fierce rehearsal of ancient injuries.

But this was not the only source of strength to the Democratic party. Time and education became its potent allies. The day finally dawned when epithets no longer stood for facts and calumny no longer usurped the place of truth. The old cry of traitors, sympathizers, copperheads, and the like wore itself out. The men who bawled it until they were hoarse became ridiculous. The spell of vituperation had vanished. The rising generation took counsel from safer sources than inflamed and unjust recitals of past events. The young men read and studied and counted the graves of the Democratic heroes who died in the great battles for human freedom, and then they lost—if they ever had it—all taste for periodical and frenzied exhibitions of malice and misrepresentation. If the party of great moral ideas could only live with the aid of the Father of Lies, it had best die. He had served it faithfully and well, but even his power had an end.

Then the Democratic party came to the front, with unabated vigor. A decade had scarcely passed after the war, the ashes of the civil commotion were not yet cold, many of its heroes were still living, when a Democratic candidate was elected by the majority of the electors and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the people to the chief magistracy of the nation. Then the sick lion found some of his old-time strength and power, enough to commit a great crime—the greatest perhaps in our history. It is not a pleasant subject for an American who loves his country to contemplate. Let us pass briefly over it. The crime was consummated, the usurpation was completed, and the victorious party, yielding in patriotic submission, accepted the wrong because it was skilfully draped in the outer garments of the law.

Thus the adversary retained its power. Skilful, wary, unscrupulous, with unlimited resources at its command, with an overflowing treasury, with old traditions of success behind and the fear of extinction before it, familiar with every ruse that long experience and wily agents could furnish, the Republican party strove to perpetuate its hold. But where was it to look for a support among those voters who cared much for right and little for office? Its moral ideas were reduced to the narrowest compass. It must still sound the old blast of sectional jealousy; it must still, by arousing the fear and anger of the South, unify the party that claimed the credit of reducing that rebellious South to submission. But the discordant note had lost its potency, and in 1884 the Democratic party elected its candidate. For the first time in a quarter of a century the party that made the nation entered the White House, and a successor of Jefferson took into his strong hands the reins of Federal administration.

The opportunity had come at last. A brave and honest Democratic President would show how vain were the fears of those who predicted ruin to the country, from the mere fact of his advent to power. The Confederate debt was not paid, the Confederate brigadiers did not mount their old chargers and resume attempted subjugation of the North. The finances were honestly and economically administered, the national honor was carefully guarded, brilliant statesmanship was not attempted, the safe traditions of a Democratic past were followed, and during the four years of that administration every citizen felt that the safety of the country was secured. No one could doubt the renewal of the trust conferred by the country. Indeed, the acquiescence was general, and hope itself seemed almost extinct in the breast of the Republican chiefs.

But the Democratic President took a serious and unprofessional view of the situation. He had imbibed the idea that he was a trustee for the whole people, and that the performance of that trust being the most sacred of duties, he must perform it at every peril. Of course

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there was much to arouse hilarity in that view of the subject, and we may well imagine that some of those who were watching their opportunity were at once encouraged and amused at the contemplation of these intellectual vagaries. That the main and most sacred function of the tenant of the White House could be any other than to secure a renewal of his lease seemed eccentric enough to deserve even a stronger name. It was evident that such a moral hallucination, if carried into practical operation, must create new and otherwise impossible chances for the ambitious outsider. Any change must brighten his prospects and revive his drooping spirits. Would the Democratic President at the crucial moment mount his hobby of public duty and disregard the dictates of sound and safe policy? That form of madness meant a chance for the Republican party, because the gods first make mad those whom they would destroy. Would the weary gods once more smile upon its shattered fortunes and permit it to re-form the disjected members of the once great party into a solid and victorious phalanx?

Whether the old gods heard the prayer of the Republicans or not, the event justified the most sanguine expectations. The Democratic President did precisely the thing that his enemies hoped and prayed for. He gave them an issue, and they almost forgot the bloody banner of the old days in their exultation, as they shouted that the Democratic party was the enemy of the American workman and the friend of English and other foreign labor. Huge sums of money were easily raised to pay the expenses of the swelling chorus, and, bright with the anticipation of a new lease, the Republican party rose from its lethargy to brave and successful effort. The letter of Napoleon written at Fontainebleau in 1814, advising the allied forces of Europe that he was ready to abdicate his throne and power, was not more effectual for its purpose than the tariff letter became as an act of abdication. It was published before the education of the people had been completed; and while truth was preparing its arms and making ready for the fray, the old fallacies were striking terror into the wage-worker lest his daily bread should be taken away. Thus, with its flag flying at the mast-head, the Democratic party went down. Its leader took all the risks and lost the game. Once more the party was in the darkness and shadow of defeat.

That all the followers of that leader took the self-procured defeat kindly, it would be idle to pretend. It is easier and pleasanter to see present advantages than those which lie in the remote future. To

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

surrender a stronghold of inestimable strength because of a conscientious scruple is not a method of warfare calculated to elicit unbounded applause from the victims of the operation. It may frankly be conceded that the average Democrat is human, and that the pride which he may take in the contemplation of heroism that brings honor and destruction together is not wholly unmixed with a dash of regret. We are not all giants in moral stature and cannot in every case emulate the lofty and judicial spirit of Washington. So there may have been repining in a few, perhaps in many, instances.

But the heart and conscience of the American people are sound. Nothing will arouse them to a sense of genuine animation and enthusiasm like acts of brave and honest self-sacrifice. We are too much accustomed to petty selfishness and narrow ambition to look upon such acts without feeling that they are as unusual as they are creditable. Though the letter on the tariff was an act of abdication, it turned out to be also the starting-point of new efforts, the enlargement of the Democratic horizon, and a new bond of union between the party and the people. It took the truth some little time to prepare for its travels, but it started at last, and the awakened and enlightened nation sent up one loud shout of approval for the policy so recently rejected. And now the people, the large majority in the North and South, believe in the tariff message, in the tariff-reform policy, in the brave and wise action of the Democratic President. The eyes of the workingman are opened, and he asks himself if it is not time to protest against a theory and practice of protection which does indeed protect, but only those who least need to be protected. The American artisan is too intelligent to admire protection when it lavishes kind words on him and large estates on his employer, and he is not wholly relieved from his misgivings as to the expediency of a high tariff because his employer generously spends a part of his increased profits in building a hospital and a reading-room for the care and entertainment of his employees. And when three years of protection run mad have failed to increase his wages to any appreciable extent, he doubts the good faith of his Republican advisers or questions their intelligence.

This, then, is to-day the position of the Democratic party. It has waited patiently for the education of the people, and it enjoys its reward. Old prejudices and foolish fears of its ascendency have been driven away, and it is proved now that there is at least one man in the party who will risk his office to save his conscience. Its path is now clear. It has earned its right to victory. Its record is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

honest. The young men of the rising generation look upon it as the party of progress and of the future. Wherein, then, lies the danger? Is there any in its way to create a reasonable doubt of its success? None, save from itself. It is, in New York at least, too strong for its own safety. It is well to have the strength of a giant, provided that strength be temperately and wisely used. But abuse of strength brings resistance, and resistance rebellion. No party is strong enough to give just grounds of resentment to its followers. Tyranny is as hateful in a political party as it is in a municipal or State government. Taxation without representation is tyranny, whether that taxation takes the form of a money tribute on ships or a duty on tea, or an exaction of loyalty without a corresponding return of protection in every legal right. The party lash may be felt and obeyed on condition that the hands that wield it have been duly commissioned to that end, and that the discipline which it implies and symbolizes shall only be exercised for legitimate party purposes. The obligation to obey is not stronger than the duty to require nothing beyond the law. Our habits of freedom are too well fixed to make us accept any other conditions of voluntary and limited servitude; when these conditions are disregarded on the one side, the compact may well be deemed at an end on the other. Partisanship has its limitations. Men enter political organizations as they enter into society: they abandon certain rights for the benefits which the organized condition is supposed to afford. If the benefits are withdrawn, what becomes of the duty of submission?

The protest formulated on the eleventh day of February by a large number of Democrats at the Cooper Union and echoed with singular enthusiasm from all parts of the State cannot in any sense be termed a rebellion. It is a solemn and deliberate warning, uttered by earnest and thoughtful men to their brethren, urging them to retrace their steps because they are on the road to disaster. To deny them this right of remonstrance would be folly; to belittle it, most imprudent. Strong as the party in this State may be, let our leaders bear in mind that at no time in our history or in the world's history have men reflected on public affairs as they do to-day. At no time has knowledge been so general or intelligent discussion of state concerns so much a public habit as to-day. Illiteracy is a phenomenon, daily growing rarer, and the time is fast approaching when an absolutely illiterate American citizen will belong to an extinct species as hard to find as a specimen of the defunct ichthyosaurus. It is not safe to rely upon mere assertions of right or exhibitions of power. Where do you get your power?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Why do you assert and whence comes that right? These questions will be asked by every man who reads a newspaper. As Lowell puts it: "You are the powers that be. Are you the powers that ought to be? is a question that will be asked." Louis XIV. might say, "I am the state," but no one has said it safely or long since the French King joined his royal fathers. The moral forces of to-day rule men, parties, and states. They laugh at bayonets; their voice is louder than the voice of cannon; they sweep away kings and governments. Even the great Napoleon, with his victorious legions behind him, was driven by moral forces to his rock. "Will the Pope's excommunication cause the muskets to fall from the hands of my soldiers?" said he, with a warrior's contempt for anything but brute force. Within four years the muskets did literally fall from the frozen hands of his heroic followers, and less than two years later he abdicated on the very spot which had been the scene of the captive Pope's coerced surrender of his rights. The Pope, aged, friendless, imprisoned, tortured by threats and importunities, represented the moral force which triumphed, as it always does, in the end.

The Democrats who assembled at the recent meeting in the Cooper Union were brought together to protect the common right of Democratic citizens by insisting that forms should not be used to strangle substance. In the language of the notice, "a convention selected in midwinter, upon so short a call, cannot be fairly and truly representative of the Democratic sentiment of the State, and would inevitably debar the mass of the Democratic voters of the State of New York from the voice which they are justly entitled to in the selection of the Democratic candidates for President and Vice-President and the framing of the party's platform." To say that these Democrats—many of them long eminent in the party councils for devotion and faithful service—were disaffected or disloyal or "mugwumps" is wholly beside the question. They stated their grievance and based their reluctance to arbitrary dictation upon the statement above quoted. If the fact was as stated by them, who could deny the justice of their remonstrance? If it were otherwise and the hastening of the convention at so unusual a season was not intended to effect an ulterior and unavowed purpose, then it was incumbent on the movers to justify their action otherwise than by frivolous pretences or angry denunciation. Just remonstrances deserve something more than ebullitions of temper in reply. Strike, if you please, but answer, if you can, otherwise than by blows. The great mass of voters can-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not be frightened into silence nor threatened into submission. They are the people, and the people constitute the court of last resort. Shams cannot live long in the daylight of free discussion. Judgment will, at some time or other, be pronounced on the merits.

The protest at the Cooper Union was not only a warning but a lesson, one that should be thankfully accepted. It means that even loyal and faithful party men will, on occasion, define their duty and their allegiance. They reserve certain sovereign rights which are not surrendered when they enter the party. They recognize that chiefs are indispensable to organization, and that success cannot be had without organization. They recognize that for the good of the party and the attainment of its ends self-denial must be practised and a generous postponement of personal preferences shown. It is obvious to them that here and elsewhere the majority must rule and the minority (save in extreme cases) submit. It is plain, too, that ready and cheerful co-operation is necessary in legitimate efforts to secure the ascendency of party principles, by promoting the success of those selected as the exponents of those principles.

But they will insist, and their leaders would, if wise, remember, that the will of the majority is only an empty and meaningless formula unless it is regularly and fairly ascertained; that any attempt to thwart the expression of such will by disingenuous or fraudulent device, or by reckless indifference, or through excessive deference to or affection for a preferred aspirant to office, may justly arouse the indignation and resentment of loyal party men. The question of personality sinks into indifference as compared with the principle involved. It is one of justice, that kind of justice which respects right and enforces duty. "This looks like a riot," said Louis XVI. when the mutterings of the great collapse first broke out into overt acts. "No, sire," was the answer, "not a riot, but a revolution." Wise rulers should beware lest riots ripen into rebellion, and rebellion into revolution, and revolution into destruction.

Some of those who discountenance the movement of which mention is made above will belittle it, others will denounce it as a "bolt." As to the former, they represent a numerous class upon whom argument has no more effect than Wagner's music on a deaf man. If they had lived in Pliny's time and had seen the angry volcano sending out its lava, they would have laughed and gone to bed, trusting with optimistic security that something or other would check the disagreeable manifestation. As to the others, it may be asked of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them, In what respect is the movement a "bolt"? This expression denotes a desertion from the ranks of the party, for the purpose of giving one's vote to a candidate other than the regular candidate of the party with which the so-called "bolter" has been affiliated. But in this case there is no such element. It is the right of every Democrat to be represented in the councils of the party personally, or by a representative in the choice of whom he has had a share or an opportunity to take part. Here it is alleged that sound customs have been violated, that great masses of our people have been practically disfranchised, that a most important convention has been called, in advance of the proper season, for the express purpose of excluding those who might oppose the wishes of influential persons having ends of their own to subserve. That this charge is really well founded has not been seriously denied. A feeble and (probably) half-humorous attempt has been made to justify this course, on the ground that the season of midwinter was more convenient for the farmer—a tender solicitude for whose interests has dictated a change which has aroused great and wide-spread indignation. *Spectatum admissi risum teneatis, amici?* Do not fear to laugh, my friends. You will not enjoy the joke half so much as those who perpetrated it for the first time.

Perhaps it may be said that to call a second convention and to send delegates to Chicago to knock at the door of the first for admission is in itself rebellion. Why, pray? For what are committees on contested seats provided, but to pass upon the very questions that the protestants are anxious to raise? To say that the first convention is regular merely begs the question. If regularity implies only an outward observance of forms and formulas, accompanied by undisguised contempt for substantial rights, then the claim is founded. But it may be that those who say that forms were designed to protect rights, not to cover wrongs, may prevail, and that they may be admitted to the convention hall. What will happen then? If, on the contrary, the National Convention choose to consummate the work of exclusion and disfranchisement, why should the so-called "regulars" complain of an appeal to the court of competent jurisdiction, especially where judgment is rendered in their favor? Nor is it necessary, as many may suppose, that a separate ticket for electors shall be run. The men placed upon the ticket will no doubt be accepted as the candidates of the Democracy, with the assurance that they will, as indeed they must, deposit the vote of the State for the nominees of the convention.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That there is danger ahead and breakers in sight may be true, but whose is the fault? Who is responsible for a condition of things easily avoided, first by a due regard for sound usages, secondly by a considerate deference to the wishes and a decent respect for the rights of thousands whose devotion to Democracy has never been impeached? It is possible, and some may think it highly probable, that the action of the leaders in this movement has in fact averted a formidable danger. Uncontrolled power is dangerous even when exercised by wise men. The wine of authority may rise to their head and obscure their vision. Does any impartial man think that it was expedient from the standpoint of the party's interest to close discussion in February on all the subjects that are to agitate the public mind in June? Was it for the benefit of the party that sharp lines of duty were drawn a few days ago without reference to the changes in the near future? Was it prudent to commit this mandate to agents to-day, when it could not be exercised until three long months had passed? The questions answer themselves.

How much good or how much evil will come of all this, we may conjecture and surmise, but we may not with any assurance predict. This we may safely say: that when the great Democratic party shall be so ruled that thousands of its members, with no fault of their own, are disfranchised without a murmur and gagged without an attempt at remonstrance, then the letters shall be seen upon the wall, then the great principles of popular rights, of State sovereignty, of equal taxation, of restriction upon Federal authority and resistance to Federal encroachment, the principles which Jefferson chose to establish for the benefit of our Nation, these principles must be committed to other hands. *Dii avertite!*

FREDERIC R. COUDERT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HOW THE NEW YORK SENATE WAS CAPTURED.

Soon after the New York election of 1891, David B. Hill, then Governor of the State, announced in a newspaper interview that nothing but cowardice would prevent the Democrats from having a majority in the newly elected State senate. The unofficial returns from the thirty-two senatorial districts showed the election of seventeen Republicans, one Independent Republican, and fourteen Democrats. Time proved that Governor Hill's announcement was no idle boast.

Claims were put forth that in four districts in which Republican candidates were said to have been elected, irregularities of one kind or another had been committed which would give seats in the senate to the Democratic candidates. In the twenty-seventh district it was claimed that the Republican candidate, Sherwood, who had received nearly 1,700 plurality, was ineligible because of his holding a city office. In the twenty-fifth district it was claimed that because of errors in the distribution of the ballots among the election districts, votes cast for the Republican candidate, who had received a plurality of about 1,400, should be thrown out, sufficient in number, to give the election to his Democratic opponent. In the sixteenth district it was claimed that there had been irregularities which would justify the conversion of a Republican plurality of 600 into a Democratic plurality. In the fifteenth district it was claimed that owing to the presence of certain marks upon some of the Republican ballots, and other irregularities, a sufficient number should be rejected to convert the Republican plurality of 68 into a Democratic plurality of 14.

In each of these four senatorial districts there was one county in which a majority of the board of supervisors, who under the law are also the board of county canvassers, were Democrats. In each of these counties this Democratic board took steps to have the Democratic claim against the Republican senatorial candidate brought before the State canvassing board. In the twenty-seventh district, which is composed of the counties of Chemung, Steuben, and Alleghany, the Democratic board of Steuben passed resolutions declaring Sherwood to have been ineligible, and attached them, with affidavits and other papers, to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

official return which it transmitted to the State board at Albany. In the twenty-fifth district, composed of the counties of Cortland and Onondaga, the Democratic board of the latter county was believed to have sent some extraneous matter to the State board in order to secure the giving of a certificate to the Democratic candidate. In the sixteenth district, composed of the counties of Rensselaer and Washington, the Democratic board of the former sent in a protest against the election of the Republican candidate, alleging irregularities at various election districts. In the fifteenth district, composed of the counties of Dutchess, Columbia, and Putnam, the Democratic board of the first-named county continued in session until after the boards of the other two had completed their work, and then passed a resolution determining and declaring the result of the election in such a way as to give the Democratic candidate a plurality, and sent a certificate and statement to the State board signed by its chairman and one Mylod as secretary *pro tem.*, which will be referred to as the Mylod certificate.

By the first of December it became evident that the State board was about to consider all these claims and protests. The Republican State committee thereupon employed counsel, who instituted legal proceedings in the interest of the various Republican candidates whose elections were threatened. Application was made on the first of December to Justice Edwards, of Hudson, of the Supreme Court of the State, for an order that the State board of canvassers should show cause why a mandamus should not issue restraining them from considering the resolution of the Steuben board as to Sherwood's eligibility, or any other document bearing on the election in the twenty-seventh district except the statement of the county board showing the number of votes cast; for a second order requiring the State board to show cause why it should not be restrained from considering or acting upon the Mylod certificate of the Dutchess board; and for a third order requiring the Dutchess County board to show cause before Justice Barnard at Poughkeepsie, why they should not be re-convened and compelled to correct the statement by which they had counted out the Republican candidate. Similar orders were issued by Justice Landon, also of the Supreme Court of the State, on December 2, requiring the State board to show cause before Justice Edwards why they should not refrain from considering anything but the certified returns from the sixteenth and twenty-fifth districts. All these orders were granted.

In compliance with these orders, counsel for the various parties appeared before Justice Edwards at Hudson on December 5, and a large

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

portion of the day was spent in discussing the questions that arose. The Justice expressed a regret that these important questions should be brought before him in the midst of a court which he was then holding, and intimated a desire that they might be put in shape where he could render a decision without a thorough examination of the questions of law involved, from which an appeal could be taken to the General Term, then in session at Albany, and thence to the Court of Appeals without delay. One of the counsel for the Republican senators then offered to make a stipulation in accordance with which the cases could be carried up through the General Term of the Supreme Court to the Court of Appeals. Mr. Maynard, the Deputy Attorney-General, who appeared as one of the counsel for the State board, while expressing personally an approval of the proposed stipulation, stated that he then had no authority from the members of the State board to enter into it, and could not sign without conferring with them. Thereupon, in order that Mr. Maynard might get the necessary authority, the court was adjourned to the city of Albany at 9 o'clock Monday morning, December 7.

At that hour Justice Edwards and the Republican counsel were on hand, and after considerable delay Mr. Maynard appeared with a stipulation ready for signature. By the terms of this stipulation all the parties to the various contests agreed to have the questions at issue carried to the Court of Appeals for decision, and that all proceedings in the State board of canvassers should be suspended until the decision was reached, "provided such decision was made prior to December 30, 1891, *and that such canvass shall be completed, and the certificates of the result and of election made and issued by the State board of canvassers in accordance with the decision of the Court of Appeals in these cases, if so made, and also in the twenty-fifth district, in accordance with the decision of the Court of Appeals in this and other appeals.*" Thereupon orders were made for a mandamus in each case as asked for by the various relators, and the stipulation above quoted was signed by the counsel for all parties. I have put in italics the words of this stipulation to which, in view of the subsequent action of the State board of canvassers, special importance is attached.

Appeals were immediately taken to the General Term, which was then in session at Albany; counsel for the various parties appeared before that Term on the same day, December 7, and an order of affirmance was made in each case without argument. From these orders of affirmance appeals were taken to the Court of Appeals then

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in session. On the morning of December 8, counsel for all parties appeared before the Court of Appeals, and the cases were set down for argument on Friday, December 11. Upon that day they were argued. In the mean time proceedings had been going on in Onondaga County, relating to the election in the twenty-fifth district, against the Onondaga board of county canvassers, and the appeals in those proceedings had also been hastened through to the Court of Appeals. But these appeals were not argued until December 15.

The Court of Appeals consists of seven judges, and at the time five of them (Chief Judge Ruger, and Judges Earl, Peckham, O'Brien, and Gray) were Democrats and two (Judges Andrews and Finch) were Republicans. Its decisions in the various cases were announced on Tuesday, December 29. Only a brief summary of these decisions can be here given. They are to be found at length in Nos. 4 and 5 of the N. Y. State Reporter, Vol. 41, and will appear in the regular series of New York Reports.

1. In the twenty-seventh district case, the Court of Appeals reversed the order of the Supreme Court. The objection made to Sherwood was that he was ineligible. He was a park commissioner in the city of Hornellsville. The New York constitution provides that no person shall be eligible to the legislature who, at the time of his election, is, or within one hundred days previous thereto has been, an officer under any city government. The Court of Appeals was unanimously of the opinion that the State board had no jurisdiction to determine the question of eligibility; that its sole duty was to make computations from the figures returned to them by the county boards according to law, and having made them, to declare the result by the proper certificate; and that in performing this duty, they were not at liberty to consider or act upon any extraneous papers or information. But the majority of the court held (Judge Earl writing the opinion), first, that Sherwood was clearly ineligible, the office of park commissioner being in the opinion of the court an office under a city government; second, it was conceded that the senate, under the constitution, was the sole judge as to the qualification of its members. But as Sherwood had invoked the aid of the court to clothe him with apparent title to the office and by its affirmative action to remove obstacles in the pathway of his proposed intrusion into the office, and as upon undisputed facts the court could see that he was ineligible, it simply determined that it would not aid him. It held that in so doing it in no way infringed upon the exclusive jurisdiction of the senate.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The English rule is that where the majority candidate is ineligible, and sufficient notice of his ineligibility has been given, the person receiving the next highest number of votes, being eligible, must be declared elected. But this rule has not been followed in this country. The House of Representatives of the United States has refused to adopt it, saying that the English rule in this particular has never been adopted in this country and is inapplicable to our system of government, and the courts of this country generally take the same view. Judge McCrary says in his "American Law of Elections":

"It is a fundamental idea with us that a majority, or at least a plurality, shall be required to elect the person to office by popular vote. An election with us is the deliberate choice of a majority or plurality of the electors. Any doctrine which opens the way for minority rule in any case is anti-republican and anti-American. The English rule, if adhered to, would in many cases result in compelling very large majorities to submit to very small minorities, as an ineligible person may receive, and in many cases has received, a great majority of the votes. It is enough in such a case to hold the election void." (McCrary on 'Elections," 3d ed., § 295.)

And it was held by the New York Court of Appeals in 1872 that where a majority of the electors, through ignorance of the law or the fact, vote for one ineligible to the office, their votes are not nullities, and the office cannot be given to the qualified person having the next highest number of votes, but the election is a failure, and a new election must be had (People vs. Clute, 50 N. Y., 452). In accordance with these views, Judge Earl, speaking of the duty of the senate, says:

"If it shall agree with this court that the relator was ineligible, and also find that his competitor was not elected, the result will be that a new election will have to be ordered in that district, and the electors there can then choose a person qualified to hold the office, and then they can be properly represented in the senate."

In this particular case Mr. Sherwood had received an opinion from a very distinguished lawyer, George F. Danforth, an ex-judge of the Court of Appeals, that he was not within the constitutional prohibition, and was therefore eligible; and his opinion, as well as one of the New York Attorney-General to the contrary, had been widely circulated throughout the district, and the electors who voted for Sherwood did so in reliance on Judge Danforth's opinion, and "through ignorance of the law" as it was afterward expounded by the Court of Appeals. In the dissenting opinion of Judge Finch, which was concurred in by Judge Andrews, after stating the above propositions as to the duties of the State board of canvassers, as to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which he says, "We are all agreed, and there exists among us no difference of opinion," the following language is used:

"Our decision entitles him to his relief even though his mandamus be quashed; for it is not to be assumed that the State canvassers will violate the settled law of the State as expounded to them by its court of last resort. Indeed, they themselves, in and by the terms of the stipulation upon which all these cases have been heard, have promised and agreed to act in accordance with the conclusions of the court. We have interpreted the law for them; we have declared that whether Sherwood was or was not eligible is a subject with which they have no concern, a question which they cannot consider, and which, however decided, can have no influence or effect upon the one distinct and definite duty which they have to perform. They are men of character and reputation, and it is not to be imagined that the strong and specific force of a mandamus is necessary to make them do their duty, as that duty has been defined by this court and as they themselves have formally promised to perform it."

The sequel will show that Judge Finch's confidence was misplaced.

2. In the twenty-fifth district, another class of questions arose under the provisions of the Ballot Reform Act, passed in 1890 and amended in 1891. In this case it was proved that certain ballots were cast at the election for Rufus T. Peck, the Republican candidate for the office of senator in the *first* election district of the town of Camillus, upon which the indorsement was, "Official Ballot for *Second* District Poll. Town of Camillus." Similar mistakes were made in other towns in Onondaga County; that is, the ballots intended for a certain election district were by mistake and inadvertence indorsed as for another district. In other words, there was an inadvertent transposition of ballots. The ballot-reform law required that on the back of each ballot should be printed the indorsement, "Official Ballot for ———," and that after the word "for" should follow the designation of the polling place for which the ballot was prepared, the date of the election, and a fac-simile of the signature of the county clerk, and that the ballot should contain no caption or other indorsement except as in the section provided. The number of ballots so transposed was 1,252. There was no pretence that any person voting these ballots thus indorsed was aware that there was anything wrong about the indorsement. It was conceded by all the judges that there was no evidence of any intentional error in distributing the ballots. The indorsement itself was proper, but the ballots were sent to the wrong district. The ballots were voted without any objection or challenge, and were counted by the inspectors of election without a protest of any sort. No one then supposed they were illegal or unofficial; but the county canvassers

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were by the decision of Justice O'Brien, of the New York Supreme Court, who was sent to Syracuse from New York by Governor Hill to hold a court in the latter county, instructed to disregard these ballots. The majority of the Court of Appeals sustained Justice O'Brien's decision, and held that these ballots should be disregarded. Throwing out these ballots gave the seat to Nichols, the Democratic candidate. The prevailing opinions were written by Judges Ruger, O'Brien, and Gray and concurred in by Judge Earl; the dissenting opinions by Judges Andrews and Peckham, concurred in by Judge Finch. It would be unprofitable here to discuss the opinions of the judges in this case, which relate to provisions of the New York Ballot Reform Law. The question was very important, and a perusal of the opinions would repay those interested in ballot reform.

3. In the sixteenth district the unanimous decision of the court was in favor of the Republican candidate, Derby. There was indeed so little to be said in favor of the contention of his opponent that the case was practically abandoned upon the argument. The irregularities alleged by Collins on the part of Derby were such as the court all agreed no board of canvassers had any right to inquire into.

4. But the most remarkable of these cases, and the one which requires the closest attention, was that of the fifteenth district, comprising the counties of Columbia, Dutchess, and Putnam. I have stated in a general way the facts relating to this district, but there are certain other facts to which it is necessary to refer to enable the reader fully to understand the action of the State board with reference to this district.

As I have already stated, an order was made by Justice Edwards on the 1st day of December, returnable on the 5th day of December before Judge Barnard, of Poughkeepsie, requiring the Dutchess County board of canvassers to show cause why they should not be re-convened and compelled to correct the statement which they had made by counting the votes cast for Deane which they had erroneously thrown out. Among the votes which they had thrown out were some which had been returned by the inspectors as having been marked for identification, and certain other ballots which had not been so returned but which the county board had thrown out on the ground that they were in fact marked for identification; the truth being that they were marked apparently by accident by the slipping up of the printer's "quad," thus making an ink mark upon each ballot. There were thirty-one of these ballots, which were returned from the town of Red Hook. The provisions of the Ballot Reform Law with regard to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ballots appearing to be marked for identification are perfectly plain. It is required by the law that when any ballots are believed by any election officer to have been marked in any way with intent that they may be identified, the inspectors of election shall write their names on the back thereof and attach them to their original certificate of canvass, with a statement of the specific grounds upon which the validity of such ballots is questioned. "*Such ballots shall be counted* in estimating the result of an election; but within thirty days after the filing of the certificate declaring such result, a writ of mandamus may issue out of the Supreme Court against the board of canvassers by whom the ballots were counted, upon the application of any candidate voted for at the election, to require a re-count of the votes; and all questions relating to the validity of such ballots, and as to whether they were properly counted, shall be determined in such proceedings" (Ballot Reform Law of 1890, as amended in 1891, § 31).

Upon the question coming up before Justice Barnard on December 5, he held, in conformity with this plain provision of law, that the county board had no right to throw out these ballots, and issued a mandamus commanding the board immediately to re-convene and correct its canvass by counting the votes for Deane, the Republican candidate, which they had erroneously thrown out. In pursuance of this mandamus the county board of canvassers met and made a re-count of the votes, by which the plurality of Osborne over Deane in Dutchess County was made 130 instead of 184, giving to Deane a majority in the district of 40. The board was re-convened and the re-canvass had, pursuant to a law of the State of New York enacted in 1880, by which it is provided that a county board may be re-convened to correct errors, and that the statement made under the order of the court on such re-canvass shall *in all places* be treated with the same effect as if such corrected statement had been a part of the original required by law (Chap. 460 of the Laws of 1880). After this re-canvass, Mr. Osborne, the Democratic candidate, applied, as he had a right to do under section 31 of the Ballot Reform Law above quoted, for a writ of mandamus requiring another re-count of the votes and for the determination of the questions relating to the validity of the ballots alleged to be marked. The ballot law also provides, in section 35, that when a ballot has been deposited upon which "a writing or mark of any kind has been placed *by the voter*, or by any other person *to his knowledge*, with the intent that such ballot shall be afterwards identified as the one voted by him, the same shall be void and of no effect." The matter came again

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

before Justice Barnard, upon the mandamus prayed for by Osborne; but there being no proof that any of the ballots in question were marked *by the voter*, or by any other person *to his knowledge*, with the intent that the ballot should be identified, Justice Barnard decided that the ballots in question could not be thrown out, and dismissed the writ. After the corrected statement and certificate was made pursuant to Justice Barnard's order, various efforts were made to keep it from the officials at Albany. But a certified copy under the hand and seal of the county clerk of Dutchess County was on the 15th day of December left at the Secretary of State's office with Mr. Benedict, the deputy secretary, and received by him without objection. Mr. Benedict, however, afterward, on the same day, notified one of the counsel for the relators, by telephone, that Mr. Rice, the Secretary, refused to file this copy because, though certified by the Dutchess County clerk, it was not sent to him by the county clerk. The law, and the order of Justice Barnard required that the county clerk should send a certified copy of such corrected statement and certificate to the Governor, the Secretary of State, and the Comptroller; but stays were granted by various justices, and upon one pretext or another this corrected state ment was not sent by the county clerk to Albany until the 21st day of December.

On that day the county clerk, having been ordered thereto not only by Justice Barnard but also by Justice Cullen, of Brooklyn, deposited in the post-office at Poughkeepsie verified copies of these corrected statements, directed to each of the above-named officers. On the ensuing day, however, it was found that these copies were not in the office of the Secretary of State, Governor, or Comptroller; and it subsequently appeared that the county clerk (a Democrat appointed by Governor Hill in place of the Republican who had been, during the pendency of the legal proceedings, removed by the Governor) appeared at Albany early in the morning of the 22d and procured the copies which he had mailed, from the offices of the officials to whom they were sent. The copy sent to the Secretary of State was delivered by the Secretary himself back to the county clerk. The county clerk obtained the copy sent to the Governor from a messenger boy in the executive chamber, whose act in delivering it up was afterward approved by the Governor. The copy directed to the Comptroller was delivered by the Comptroller's messenger to Mr. Maynard, then Deputy Attorney-General, and counsel for the State board, at his request. These facts were elicited upon an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

investigation instituted before Justice Cullen to punish the county clerk for contempt in disregarding his order. It also there appeared that the county clerk applied to Governor Hill for instructions as to how he should get back these copies, and was referred by him to Mr. Maynard as counsel for the State board.

The deposit in the post-office had been made pursuant to a statute requiring such deposits to be made by the county clerk. The county clerk had, by making the deposits in the post-office, parted with the custody of these papers. They belonged in the respective offices of the Governor, Secretary of State, and Comptroller. It was the plain duty of each of these officials to retain them. The surrender of these records by these officials to the county clerk, and the removal of them from the offices where they belonged by the county clerk, were criminal offences under the Penal Code of New York (§§ 94 and 531), subjecting the offender to severe penalties.

On December 23d a copy of the corrected statement and certificate, certified by the county clerk of Dutchess County, under his seal, and accompanied by an affidavit that the same had been duly mailed at Poughkeepsie on the 21st by the county clerk, was served personally upon each member of the State board. Each member of the State board was then put in possession of a duly authenticated copy of the statement and certificate corrected by order of the court, which, taken in connection with the undisputed returns from the other two counties in the district, was conclusive information to them that Deane was elected over Osborne by a plurality of 40 votes.

The Court of Appeals' decisions were rendered on December 29. On that day the Secretary of State had in his possession (unless he had wrongfully parted with them) two certified copies of the corrected statement and certificate from Dutchess County; he had wrongfully parted with the copy received by him by mail from the county clerk. Each member of the State board had in his possession (unless he had wrongfully parted with it) a certified copy of this corrected statement and certificate under the hand and seal of the county clerk. The relators in this case had applied to Justice Edwards for a mandamus upon two grounds: (1) Because the Mylod certificate was irregular and void on its face, because not certified by the county clerk of Dutchess County, under his seal; and (2) because, irrespective of this irregularity, it was based upon an illegal and wrongful canvass made by the county board, whereby that board had thrown out votes which should have been counted for Deane, and thus changed the result of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

senatorial election in the fifteenth district. The first objection to the Mylod return was formal and to some extent technical. The second was vital and substantial. The decision and order of the Court of Appeals was "that the order for the writ and the writ itself should be modified by striking out the provisions requiring a return to be certified by and to come from the county clerk of Dutchess County, and under his seal, and as so modified the order is affirmed." The order of Special Term which was affirmed by the Court of Appeals as modified, commanded the State board to disregard the Mylod certificate, and instead thereof to consider "only such return from the County of Dutchess as may hereafter be filed *containing the signatures of the county clerk of the County of Dutchess and the chairman of said board of county canvassers, and issued under the seal of said county clerk.*" The modification made by the Court of Appeals consisted in striking out the words in italics, thus leaving the prohibition against canvassing the Mylod return in full force.

The court overruled the formal objection, holding that the duties of the county clerk as secretary of the board were merely ministerial, and that upon his refusal to certify and attest the statement made by the board, it had power to appoint a secretary *pro tem.*, whose signature to a certificate signed also by the chairman would be sufficient; but it sustained the substantial objection to the Mylod return, saying, "As it contained the result of an illegal and erroneous canvass by the board of county canvassers in excess of its jurisdiction, and which would thereby alter the result of an election, the court should not permit it to be canvassed." In other words, it held that the Mylod certificate was good enough in form, but bad in substance. The plain effect of the modification was to continue in force the command that the State board should disregard the Mylod return, and consider only such return from the County of Dutchess as might thereafter be filed, without regard to whether it came from or was certified by the county clerk.

Counsel for both parties, immediately after the decisions were announced, went into the secretary of state's office, and the opinions were read. By these decisions the twenty-fifth district was given to the Democratic candidate; the sixteenth to the Republican; in the twenty-seventh district, although the order was reversed, the unanimous opinion of the Court of Appeals was that the State board had no jurisdiction to consider the question of Sherwood's eligibility; in the fifteenth district the State board was prohibited from considering or canvassing the Mylod return, the effect of which necessarily was to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

require a certificate to be given of the election of Deane. The legitimate result of these decisions was to seat Derby, Republican, in the sixteenth district; Nichols, Democratic, in the twenty-fifth; to order a new election in the fifteenth by reason of the death of Deane, which occurred after election; and to order a new election in the twenty-seventh district by reason of the ineligibility of Sherwood, provided the senate should concur with the Court of Appeals in respect to such ineligibility. The State board by these decisions was permitted to give certificates to only one Democrat in addition to the 14 whose election was undisputed. This would give to the Democrats only 15 members on the organization of the senate, while the Republicans, including the one Independent, would have 15. Two seats, those from the fifteenth and the twenty-seventh, would be vacant. But the 14 Republicans could leave the senate without a quorum, even though the Independent Republican should refuse to act with them.

This state of things was not pleasing to the Democratic managers. A long consultation was immediately had in the executive chamber between the Governor, the counsel, and some members of the State board. Up to about four o'cock it was understood to be conceded by the counsel for the Democrats that under the decisions a certificate could not be given to Osborne in the fifteenth district. The case as presented to the State board was this: The order of Justice Edwards, affirmed by the Court of Appeals, forbade them to canvass the Mylod certificate. Their own stipulation, entered into by their counsel with their approval, bound them in honor to abstain from canvassing the Mylod certificate. The law of the State, which requires the corrected return *in all places* to be considered as a part of the original return, as if it had been contained therein, required them to canvass the corrected return with one or more certified copies of which each member had been served, and to disregard the Mylod return so far as it related to the office of senator. The members of this board had each of them taken an oath faithfully to perform the duties of his office. The obligations of their oaths required them not to canvass the Mylod certificate. The law of the State made wilful neglect of any duty on the part of any officer upon whom such duty was enjoined by any statute relating to elections, a misdemeanor punishable by a fine and imprisonment. The penal code of the State provided that where a duty was enjoined upon a public officer, every wilful omission to perform such duty should be punishable as a misdemeanor. A decent respect for the criminal laws of the State, therefore, would have pre-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vented these officials from canvassing the illegal and false Mylod certificate.

But there was a power which to these officials was higher than the law, higher than the mandates of any court, higher than honor, higher than the obligations of their oaths, higher than the penal statutes of the State. This power was the will of David B. Hill, then Governor of the State of New York. Every act of these officials and of the State board was inspired and directed by the Governor. As to this there has never been any disguise or dispute. The Governor, too, had taken an oath to support the constitution of the State of New York and faithfully to perform the duties of his high office. One of the chief duties imposed upon him by that constitution was that he should "take care" that the laws were "faithfully executed." He had during the previous winter been elected by the legislature to the United States Senate, which commenced its session on the 1st of December, 1891. He kept away from the Senate and neglected his duties as Senator in order that he might violate his oath of office and his duty as Governor, by taking care that the laws should *not* be faithfully executed.

The State board again convened on the evening of December 29, 1891. Certificates were given, pursuant to the decisions of the court, to Derby as senator in the sixteenth, and Nichols in the twenty-fifth district. Upon motion of Mr. Tabor, Attorney-General, a certificate was awarded to Mr. Osborne as senator in the fifteenth district, in spite of the fact that every member of the board knew that he was not entitled to the office, but was a defeated candidate. On motion of Mr. Danforth, State Treasurer, a resolution was adopted declaring Sherwood to be ineligible, and submitting to the senate the question as to whether his opponent had been elected. Upon the convening of the senate in January, that body, instead of ordering a new election in accordance with the opinion of the Court of Appeals, under the pressure of the previous question which had been before unknown to that body, and by the aid of the defeated candidate, Osborne, who had received a certificate unlawfully given by the State board, passed a resolution without any hearing, investigation, or examination, giving the seat in the twenty-seventh district to Walker, the Democratic candidate, who was conceded to have been defeated at the polls by a majority of over 1,600. This action on the part of the State board and the senate gave to the Democrats 17 senators, 2 of whom had been defeated at the polls, and made that body Democratic.

Upon the night of the last day of the year, 1891, a dinner was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

given in honor of Governor Hill at the Kenmore Hotel, in Albany. This was described in the Democratic papers as "a farewell feast and jollification over the victories of the recent campaign." The Secretary of State, Frank Rice, sat at the head of the table. On his right was Governor Hill, and near him on either side were various members of the State board. These officials testified to each other's honesty and efficiency. The Governor and the members of the State board all congratulated each other on what to others seemed the "deep damnation of the taking off" of the lawfully elected senator from the fifteenth. With undisturbed complacency, if not with pious fervor, the Governor thanked Heaven that "the Republican party had not been able to steal the legislature." There was no question then, and there is no question now, that the man who was more responsible than all others for making the Republican senate Democratic was David B. Hill. If the mode by which that feat was accomplished deserves honor and glory, to him the honor and glory belong. If it was disgraceful, dishonorable, and criminal, his is the disgrace, the dishonor, and the crime; for the perpetrators of the acts which have been detailed were but puppets, moving as his master-hand directed.

It was said by a late distinguished Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States that in this country the law is supreme. "No man is so high as to be above the law; no officer of the government may disregard it with impunity. To their inborn and native regard for law as a governing power we are indebted largely for the wonderful success and prosperity of our people and for the security of our rights." Were these remarks of Mr. Justice Miller true, or have we at last found a man so high as to be above the law? And may a high officer of the government, in order to promote his own personal ambition or the success of his party, not only violate the law and his oath of office with impunity, but make such violation the basis for demanding the highest honor his country can confer? Shall the Bible rule be reversed and he who has been faithless over a few things be made ruler over many things?

As I write these words [February 22, 1892] a convention assembled within a stone's throw of where I sit, claiming to represent a great party in a great State, is proposing to submit these questions to the people of the United States. To doubt what their answer will be, if they are compelled to answer at all, is to doubt the capacity of the American people for self-government and their attachment to free institutions.

MATTHEW HALE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OUR ANTHRACITE SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION.

THE greatest known deposit of anthracite coal is that of eastern Pennsylvania, in which locality it occurs over a region containing about 1,700 square miles, though the area which is actually underlaid with workable beds does not exceed 483 square miles. Its chief geological divisions are known as the Wyoming, the Lehigh, and the Schuylkill regions, and the coals these districts produce are similarly designated. They differ somewhat in their chemical and mechanical peculiarities, though in many instances their chief distinction is that they reach their market by certain transportation routes, for it has often occurred that the coal produced at a certain colliery was classed as Lehigh coal if it were carried over either of the Lehigh railroads, and was called Schuylkill coal if carried over the Reading Railroad.

It may, however, be said that in general in the Wyoming region the coal beds are more nearly horizontal, are geologically less disturbed, and, the gaseous ingredients not having been so thoroughly driven off, the coals are more free-burning than those of the other districts. The latter characteristic makes their smaller coals, which are used largely for the production of steam, more desirable than the same sizes of the harder coals, as they are more easily ignited and more quickly responsive to increased draft when the fire burns low and needs to be quickened to greater activity. The process of coal formation seems also to have gone on in this region with less interruption from the intercalation of beds of other material forming slates, so that the coal is much more readily prepared for market, and to that extent is more cheaply produced than that of the other regions.

The Lehigh region is characterized by coals of denser structure with little volatile matter, so that they do not readily ignite. They last well in the fire, and are therefore specially in demand for metallurgical purposes requiring a high and continuous heat, but the small steam coals are difficult to burn steadily, and respond slowly to forced draft, so that while they produce great heat, they are not favorites with firemen, being troublesome in comparison with Wyoming coals.

During the period of coal formation the Schuylkill region was sub-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ject to interruptions of the plant growth, and to the deposit of strata of slate and other impurities between the beds of coal. Where these are intercalated and interstratified with the subdivisions of the coal beds and cannot be separated from the coal before they are taken from the mine, it follows that much refuse must be hoisted to the surface, and afterward laboriously picked out from the coal, which processes considerably increase the cost of producing coal in this region.

The dividing line between the Lehigh and the Schuylkill regions has been variously drawn, and the estimates of the areas of the two regions are therefore somewhat discrepant. There are also differing estimates of the average aggregate thickness of the coal beds in the three regions, but one of the most careful estimates is as follows:

	Square miles.	Per cent of total tonnage of Pa. anthracite.
Wyoming region	194	34
Lehigh "	51	8
Schuylkill "	238	58

The same estimate gave as the total original contents of these anthracite beds, based upon the above-estimated areas and the estimated average thickness of the coal beds, 14,453,397,600 cubic yards of coal, or the same number of tons, if, as is frequently done, the cubic yard and the ton of 2,240 pounds are assumed to be equivalent quantities.

Pennsylvania anthracite was first put to practical use in the year 1768 in a blacksmith forge by two brothers named Gore. The first shipment to a distant market was made in the flatboats which in 1775 were sent down the Susquehanna River with coal for the government armory at Carlisle; but no organized effort was made to mine it till 1793, when the Lehigh Coal Mine Company was formed to work the deposit at Summit Hill, near Mauch Chunk. The enterprise developed slowly, and it was not till 1803 that the company started six flatboats, or river arks, containing each ten tons of coal, down the Lehigh River. Of these only two reached Philadelphia, and, as no one knew how to burn the coal, this special coal being the hardest of all the anthracites, the venture resulted in failure; and it was not till 1820 that the shipment from the same mines of 365 tons marked the real beginning of the trade, which has since grown steadily, carrying the production of this fuel up to 100,000 tons in 1829, to 1,000,000 tons in 1842, to 10,000,000 tons in 1864, and to 40,000,000 tons in 1891.

The demand for anthracite has been subject to very considerable fluctuations, the trade depending upon the general prosperity of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

country as all other industries must do; but its growth has on the whole been remarkably steady, for it has been promoted by three great causes whose combined action has been unceasingly increasing the necessity for this fuel. These are (1) the increase in population, (2) the decrease in the wood supply, and (3) the decrease in freight rates. Of course, these causes affect the trade in bituminous coal as well, and the comparative cheapness of that coal causes its production to grow more rapidly than the production of anthracite; but the latter is so much the better domestic fuel, and so much to be preferred for all uses where the smoke and dirt that are caused by the burning of bituminous coal are objectionable, that the growth of the anthracite trade is likely to be seriously checked only when its increasing cost makes it too much an article of luxury to be generally used. The increase of cost will come (1) from the greater amount of capital required to open mines as they penetrate the earth more deeply, (2) from the greater cost of keeping them open while the coal is being mined, and (3) from the greater amount of refuse to be hoisted and the greater amount of water to be pumped as the mining reaches greater depths.

It is estimated in the older part of the anthracite region that it takes an expenditure of about two dollars to open a mine for every ton of annual production, so that, to bring to the self-sustaining point a colliery capable of producing 100,000 tons per annum, an outlay of $200,000 must be made. This is a moderate estimate, and shows how greatly the element of the cost of mining has increased of late years when it is compared with the case of a colliery which was opened in the Shenandoah district of the Schuylkill region thirty years ago. At this colliery the coal that was cut and shipped during the opening of the mine paid for its production, so that the development of the colliery cost nothing at all. It is true that this occurred during the war, when coal sold at excessively high prices, and it must be admitted that this instance is an exceptional one. As the workings become deeper, the mass of the rock strata that must be supported after the withdrawal of the coal becomes greater, and, to keep open the permanent passages in the mines, heavier and heavier timber is required. And this timber, which used to grow in the neighborhood of the mines and was hauled on wagons, now must be brought an average distance of one hundred miles by rail, and this distance is constantly increasing as the forests disappear.

The deeper working tends to greater breaking of the rock strata and the further cracking of the ground above, so that it becomes more

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and more difficult to keep the surface water from going down into the mines. These causes have already produced a most serious increase of expenses, it being now necessary at some collieries to hoist to the surface and haul away to a safe distance from the pit mouth two tons of refuse and to pump ten tons of water for every ton of coal that is shipped to market. As this material has to be hoisted in some cases a thousand feet vertically, it will be seen how great an expenditure of power is required, and it will not seem surprising that at such mines one ton of coal is burned for every ten tons that are marketed.

The cost of coal must, therefore, increase steadily, though not for the present rapidly, and its first effect will be in the gradual substitution of coke in many manufacturing processes requiring a cleaner fuel than bituminous coal. Later it will lead to the utilization of such particles of anthracite as are too small to burn without special appliances and that must be cemented together into pieces of more available size; but the ultimate effect must be to restrict the use of anthracite to domestic consumption within a limited though large area, whose boundaries will be governed largely by the rates of freight that may be charged by the transportation companies. For the last twenty years the demand for anthracite has annually increased at the rate of a little over four per cent per annum. It now requires 40,000,000 tons each year; but what its rate of growth in the future, what the maximum production, and what the duration of the supply will be are questions about which all estimates must be the rudest approximations, as the factors that will enter into the computation in the future are now largely unknown.

The estimate of the original contents of the anthracite fields, which has been before quoted, places the amount at about 14,453,400,000 tons. From this amount must be subtracted, to get that now remaining available, the quantity mined up to December 31, 1891, which the best authorities estimate at 844,019,239 tons. It is not probable that more than one-quarter of the coal that was originally contained in the whole area which has been worked over to this date has been sent to market; but, as some of the coal that was left in the mines is still available for use at some future day when the price shall have risen so high as to permit the abandoned beds to be reworked, we may assume that the product to this date represents three times as much of original content, or, say, 2,532,000,000 tons. This would leave about 11,921,400,000 tons to be worked, or about eighty-two and one-half per cent of the original content. How much of this can be won de-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pends largely on the perfecting of the processes of mining the coal, preparing it for market, and burning those portions which are now waste products.

In the past the general practice of mining has been to leave so much coal standing as pillars between the chambers out of which the coal is being taken as to keep the roof rock from falling, the amount required for this purpose varying from one-quarter to one-half of the whole content of the bed. The waste from this source will be greatly reduced in the future by some of the various methods practised in European countries, such as blasting down the overlying rock and building of this material walls to serve as pillars, so that the coal pillars may be taken out.

After the coal has been hoisted from the mine, a large percentage is destroyed for practical purposes in the process of breaking and screening it into sizes suitable for marketing, which two operations are technically termed "preparing" the coal. These operations result in reducing a large proportion of the coal to sizes too fine for the market, the percentage of waste from this source varying very greatly, being comparatively small where the coal is tough and the best appliances for breaking are used, and large where the coal is friable and the breaking machinery is unsuitable. On the whole, the average waste in "preparation" in the past has not fallen much short of twenty per cent of the coal hoisted from the collieries. This has been much diminished of late years chiefly by the utilization of the smaller sizes of coal. This economy has progressed so far that whereas not more than ten years ago most of the coal was thrown away that was of sizes smaller than pea coal, which corresponds in size to an ordinary chestnut, there is now a general marketing of all sizes of coal down to "No. 2 buckwheat," which is about the size of grains of Indian corn. This is an enormous saving, for these sizes, which were wasted ten years ago, amount at some collieries to more than twenty per cent of the whole production.

And this process of rescuing fuel from the waste heaps is destined to go much further, in the more general use of the finer particles of coal, whether by improved appliances for burning the smaller coals, or by combining them into larger pieces by pressure after the admixture of some adhesive substance, or by teaching the consumer that much of that which he now rejects because of its unsightly appearance is fuel of excellent quality; as, for instance, that which is called Lehigh "bony" coal, and which is discredited on account of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dull streaks running through it, is known locally, and has been proved by chemical analysis, to be exceptionally pure coal, capable of producing as good results as that which is most lustrous. On the whole, it may not be going too far to suppose that improved methods of mining and of preparing the coal, and the increased utilization of the coal waste, may enable us to use as fuel one-half of the coal now remaining, so that we may assume that there are still 5,960,700,000 tons of anthracite available before the beds shall be wholly exhausted.

This is perhaps an extreme estimate. It is certainly much larger than the one I made in 1880, when it was my duty to study this subject in connection with a report on the Reading coal lands. But most of the improved and more conservative methods of mining, preparing, and burning coal that justify the present estimate had not then come into use, and that estimate was intentionally conservative, while this one is intentionally liberal. It is likely that under favorable circumstances the mining of the next twenty years may realize a larger percentage than one-half of the coal in the ground, and the enhanced price may in the future act as an extraordinary inducement to economy in mining; so that results of which we now have no conception may be realized. All that it is safe to say in regard to any prediction on this subject is that it will probably be falsified by the event. I can only remark now that I cannot conjecture whether this one is more likely to err on the side of excess or of deficiency.

The time that will elapse before the total exhaustion of the anthracite supply depends, of course, on the rate at which it is used. We have, as before stated, reached an annual consumption of 40,000,000 tons, and this consumption has been for some years increasing at the rate of four per cent per annum. But it is not likely that this rate of increase will long continue. The whole coal field is so well supplied with collieries, and some parts of it are now so near their probable maximum rate of yield, that it may be assumed that the annual output will never be increased more than fifty per cent above the present amount. If the limit of annual product is placed at 60,000,000 tons, we should have coal at this average rate for about 100 years, though this period may be somewhat prolonged by the diminution of the output as parts of the field cease altogether to produce.

The recent consolidation of the interests of several of the largest transporters of anthracite, which together carry to market about fifty-seven per cent of the total product, has caused much comment and provoked some criticism. The projectors of this movement expect to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

benefit themselves without injury to the consumer by mining more cheaply, which they can do through the cessation of work at the expensive collieries, thus permitting the more constant operation of the profitable ones; by transporting more cheaply, because the business will be better systematized, and, moving more regularly, will not require so large a transportation equipment; and by marketing more cheaply, as each interest need no longer employ agents to undersell the others. A firm maintenance of the published prices may prevent the largest purchasers from obtaining such advantages over the smaller consumers as they have been able to get in the past; but the price of coal need not be advanced to the ordinary buyer, and very considerable gain to the producer and transporter can be made out of the conservation of the energy which has been hitherto wasted in the friction of the parts.

This movement is one of many attempts which are now being made to get away from the false idea that competition is the sole law which should regulate trade, and to base industrial operations on the truer thought that business should rest on organization, co-operation, and reasonable consideration for the prosperity of others. In other words, it is beginning to be recognized that industrial warfare is no better a regulator of business than private warfare is of social intercourse. It is this feeling—for it has scarcely yet come to be a governing thought—that has led to the organization of labor on the one hand, and to the organization of capital on the other, labor seeking to reduce its hours and increase its earnings, and capital, which is crystallized labor, striving to prevent the dissipation of what it has so laboriously gathered. Each is wrong in its aims when it seeks exclusive domination; both will be right when they learn that they are forces which must work in harmony to carry out the ancient command to subdue and replenish the earth. Strikes and trusts are the clumsy attempts of the giants, Labor and Capital, to carve out each a world in which he shall be sole lord. Co-operation will be the form in which they will work together when they realize, as they are coming to do, that as enemies they can only harm each other, while as allies they are masters of the world.

JOSEPH S. HARRIS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE GERMANS AS EMIGRANTS AND COLONISTS.

THE impulse to leave old homes and to seek elsewhere more favorable conditions of existence is an important progressive factor in the history of mankind, whether it be that uncultivated territories are opened to immigration, that more hopeful and stronger elements take the place of weaker and lower ones, or that the union of different races produces a more vigorous generation. But although the change of homes is constantly recurring, its forms differ, for it may be either forcible conquest or peaceful colonization. One great cause of emigration, namely, religious and political persecution, is to-day, with the exception of the barbarous persecutions in Russia, extinct, and the main cause of modern emigration is the disproportion between the population and the means of subsistence. Men leave their overcrowded homes in order to find more profitable employment in foreign parts. France has scarcely any emigration, because her population does not increase, nay, has decreased; Russia has none, because her scanty population has unlimited elbow-room in that huge empire; but, on the other hand, Great Britain, Ireland, and Germany furnish the largest proportion of emigrants because they are over-peopled. Overpopulation has operated the more intensely in the period from 1830 down to the present day, because progressive civilization has furnished the means to avoid the gaps which formerly were created by famine, contagious diseases, and wars. By the Thirty Years' War, Germany lost more than half of her population; the continuous wars of the eighteenth century and of the period of the French Revolution had a similar effect, and in 1815 the country was decidedly under-peopled. But during the ensuing long period of peace the population rose fast, as is shown by the following table:

1816	24,831,396	1855	36,111,644
1820	26,291,606	1860	37,745,187
1825	28,111,269	1865	39,653,544
1830	29,518,125	1870	40,816,249
1835	30,935,648	1875	42,727,372
1840	32,785,150	1880	45,234,061
1845	34,396,055	1885	46,855,704
1850	35,395,496	1890	49,639,758

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This increase is the more noteworthy, as the total German emigration from 1820 to 1888 is estimated at about 6,000,000, whilst the immigration was quite insignificant. The population has, therefore, more than doubled in a comparatively limited period. It is true that a country is not necessarily over-peopled if it have more inhabitants than its soil can support, for it may buy abroad the requisite food which is paid for by the products of its industry. This is the case with Germany. Formerly an agricultural country, it has become more and more an industrial one. In 1830 its total commerce *per capita* was $6, and in 1882, $35. Formerly self-supplying with food, it now imports more than $100,000,000 worth of corn a year. It, therefore, has principally to rely on the export of manufactured goods, which have to struggle with many difficulties. Geographically, Germany does not form a compact economic territory like France and England. Most of our largest industrial districts are obliged to go for import and export service to foreign ports, such as Amsterdam, Rotterdam, Antwerp, Havre, which, on account of their more favorable maritime situations, outstrip Hamburg and Bremen by several days. Our richest coal-mines are far distant from the sea.

German industry, therefore, in order to compete successfully in foreign markets, is obliged to produce at cheaper prices, which involve lower wages, and consequently the workmen are frequently underfed and overworked. Constantly new inventions make greater the economy of human labor, which, with the increase of the population, has the result of making the supply of labor in excess of the demand. Of course this struggle for life would be still more intense but for emigration, which furnishes somewhat more room for the remaining inhabitants. But, on one hand, large as this emigration appears, in comparison with the increase of the population it is by far too small to act as a sufficient corrective. From 1872 to 1876 the excess of births over deaths was 8,656,644, whilst the emigration amounted to only 1,500,000, its total from 1820 to 1888 being about 6,000,000 and the increase of the population 23,000,000. On the other hand, emigration, if it somewhat alleviates the condition of the remaining population, is by no means an unqualified boon, for most emigrants are in the prime of life. A given number of emigrants represents a far larger amount of productive power than the same number of the average population. Besides, the emigrants do not belong to the class of paupers, for these have neither the necessary capital for paying the passage and the cost of the first settlement, nor generally the capac-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ity for work required for success in foreign countries. Even if the government should step in and encourage the passage of paupers in order to get rid of them, the states to which the emigration is directed would take good care to prevent such an influx of unwelcome immigrants. The American law refuses entry to all persons convicted of crimes or who are likely to be a charge on public charity and prohibits the immigration of persons engaged for labor by previous contracts. Most emigrants are small proprietors and merchants, handicraftsmen, and strong young workmen, who have sufficient means to start life anew. We lose these and keep the needy people. Reckoning the capital which the emigrants carry off with them at only $100 a head, the sum makes $600,000,000, and the cost of education invested in them is certainly far larger.

This surely is a very unsatisfactory state of things, for German emigration is not colonization in the stricter sense of the word. A colony is the settlement of a certain number of men in a territory which is not yet inhabited by men of their nationality, whatever be the cause of such settlement. But as soon as the foreign settlers are absorbed by another nationality, they no longer constitute a colony. Yet this is precisely the case with German emigration. It is nearly lost to the mother country because it is unorganized. A French author has compared it to a large army which is annually sent out and disappears as soon as it has crossed the frontier. German immigration has greatly contributed to the wonderful development of the United States. Dr. Poesche, a former official of the Washington Statistical Department, estimates the number of Germans in the United States at seven millions, or fourteen per cent of the whole population. They form one of the most active and useful elements of American citizenship, and they have exercised a considerable and beneficent influence on the political and intellectual life of their new home. But, although there are sections entirely inhabited by Germans, the attempts to found compact German colonies in Texas and in the West have failed. The Germans in America may have their own churches and synods, schools and newspapers, but their language will never be spoken in Congress; and, much as the unification of the mother country has raised the self-esteem of Germans all over the world, a German nation within the American nation is impossible, for the immigrants are gradually absorbed. It is somewhat different with the German settlements in southern Brazil, numbering in the provinces of Rio Grande do Sul, São Paulo, Parana, and Sta.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Catharina about 250,000 people. There they have maintained their independent nationality, notwithstanding the pressure of the Portuguese element, because the German colonists are superior to them, and the commerce of these provinces is entirely in German hands. In the same way we find German colonies in southern Russia, Transylvania, Palestine, and elsewhere, but these are exceptions; for, as a rule, German immigrants, at least their children, become part of the nationality which forms the great majority of the inhabitants of their new home. It is easy to understand that in Germany this was felt to be a humiliation; for, in the period of mediæval power of the former empire, the Germans stood foremost among the colonizing nations. They pushed back the heathen Slavs between the Elbe and the Oder, and gave to Brandenburg, Pomerania, Prussia, and Silesia their present German character. The Teutonic order established its dominion in the Baltic Provinces; German colonies were founded on the Lower Danube, in Hungary, and Transylvania; and, above all, the Hanseatic League rose as a real international power with its numerous settlements in England, Flanders, Norway, Sweden, and Russia down to Novgorod. It was only the want of territorial contiguity that prevented the League from maintaining itself, when those powers in which its settlements were situated grew stronger and were loth to tolerate such a state within the state. The decline of the League coincides with the growing division of Germany. Germany had in the times of the great trans-Atlantic discoveries all the elements of successful colonization, a growing population, seafaring men, and the genius of enterprise, but she lacked a strong government.

Charles V., who was much more a Spaniard and Dutchman than a German, supported but weakly the attempts of the Augsburg merchant-princes to colonize Venezuela, and the settlements soon passed under Spanish dominion. The great elector of Brandenburg perfectly discerned the importance of colonies and the advantages which other European states derived from them; and, notwithstanding the exhaustion of his small country, he founded fortified settlements on the western coast of Africa; but his two successors were blind to his large views, and Frederick William I. sold the Prussian colonies to Holland. Frederick the Great in his life-and-death struggle had not the means of acquiring colonies, but founded privileged companies for commerce with China and Bengal, which prospered at first, but were afterwards ruined by English jealousy. From that time until our own day no attempt to found colonies was made. German discover-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ers and explorers shone in the first ranks, German sailors were among the best known, the German commercial fleet was the third in tonnage, German industry was highly developed, German merchants were to be found among the leading firms in all parts of the world, and they are as numerous in New York, China, Mexico, Rio de Janeiro, Buenos Ayres, and Valparaiso as they are in European capitals. Germany is now a first-rate power, taking the leading part in European politics; she has a strong navy, able to protect her citizens abroad, and everywhere respected; and above all, Germans are considered as belonging to the best colonists.[1] Yet in trans-Atlantic countries they are esteemed only for their personal qualities and are obliged to adopt foreign ways. The reason is that we had colonists enough, but no colonies. Colonization in its proper sense is something very different from establishing new commercial relations and opening new markets to home industry. It involves dominion over a certain region, either to people it or to govern a native population, and to organize and to educate it economically.

As long as Germany was split up into a number of states, there could be no question of colonies, but after the establishment of her unity it was but natural that the question should arise, whether the present conditions ought to be accepted for the future also as an unavoidable evil, or whether we should continue simply to give away the best surplus of our population to other countries, which profit by it, whilst our emigrants, educated at our expense, become our competitors for agricultural and industrial products. Should this large emigration form only a safety-valve and an insufficient one for over-population; or are Germans, who are equal to any other people in the development of their own land, not to enlarge their economical field of activity by colonization and thus open new and promising prospects to the exuberant forces of the nation in regions which wait only for a cultivating hand in order to become a new Germany?

Such were the questions first formulated in Dr. Fabri's book "Does Germany Need Colonies?" which gave the decisive impulse to

[1] The celebrated traveller Baron Hübner says in this respect: "The German settler has all the qualities which distinguish the English, with somewhat less initiative, whilst he is less inclined to adventures. He is calm, sober, economical, striving less to become quickly rich, and better educated. After all, the German and the Anglo-Saxon emigrants are of the same value. All unbiassed observers pronounce them to be *pares inter nationes*. This is particularly the case in the most important branch, agriculture—the German and the Scotch are considered the best farmers."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the colonial movement leading to the foundation of the Colonial Union in December, 1882. This movement was not made. Prince Bismarck for years looked at it unfavorably, for he was afraid that any trans-Atlantic settlements might be resented by England, with whom he was anxious to remain on good terms in case of a new war. When, therefore, a company of capitalists was formed at Berlin for founding a colony in North Borneo which asked nothing from the government but its protection, he refused it; and thus North Borneo somewhat later fell into English hands. The Rhenish Missionary Society, which had founded in south-west Africa a commercial company under English protection, came into distress when in 1880 the English evacuated the country and the directors invoked the protection of the German government; but the chancellor declined to give any aid, and thus this prospering enterprise was doomed. It was only when he saw that the colonial movement was fast spreading and becoming an important electoral factor, and when at the same time the intrigues in Capeland and the want of decision of the British government sorely tried his patience, that he abandoned his former resolution.

A Bremen merchant, Lüderitz, had bought from a Hottentot chief the territory of Angra Pequeña, north of the Cape Colony. This excited the jealousy of the British authorities, who contrived to throw difficulties in his way. He invoked the German government's protection, and the chancellor asked in London whether England had any well-founded claim upon that territory, but got no answer within a year. Then he suddenly ordered his consul-general at Cape Town to declare officially that Lüderitz and his possessions were under German protection. The enthusiastic applause which this step provoked led to further occupations. On the African slave-coast Hamburg firms had founded important establishments, and they made complaint of the invidious treatment of other powers and of the attacks of native chiefs. The German government came to their rescue, and Cameroon and Togoland were placed under its protectorate. The same took place in New Guinea, where Hamburg interests were constantly menaced by the demand of the Australian colonies for annexation. The British government showing some displeasure at these strides of a new colonial power, Prince Bismarck in a despatch of August 1, 1884, to the ambassador in London observed that no power had a right to prevent the occupation of a territory hitherto independent, on the plea that the latter fell into its sphere of influence or that it had intended to occupy such country. England was obliged

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to yield, and in 1885 signed a convention with Germany delineating the respective possessions of West Africa and New Guinea, which in 1886 was followed by a similar treaty regarding East Africa.

The task was now to organize and to govern the colonies. Prince Bismarck's first programme was that colonization should be a matter of private enterprise to which the responsibility for founding colonies and for their development should be given, and the government would only give charters to companies formed for this purpose and would protect them against any aggression. The chancellor was certainly right in disclaiming colonial conquest after the fashion of the French in Tonquin and Madagascar, which costs enormous sums to the mother country without yielding any profit; but his idea of self-governing colonial companies soon proved impracticable. The former British and Dutch East India companies to which he referred had the monopoly of commerce with the mother country, whilst under present circumstances it would be impossible to give such privileges to German companies. Their charters would not be applicable to the recent German acquisitions, because these companies had to deal with countries where a certain civilization and order existed under native princes, whilst the new settlements in Africa and New Guinea were inhabited by savage tribes. Finally, the rule of those powerful companies was recognized by England and Holland as an untenable anomaly, and they have been bought out by the government, which took the management of the colony into its own hands. The Hamburg merchants, therefore, declared in September, 1884, that a colony could not prosper under private enterprise, for it ought to have a governor with jurisdiction, supported by a police force sufficient to enforce his rule. They were undoubtedly right, the more so as according to international law no territory can belong to private persons without a recognized state being responsible for what happens in it.

So a governor was sent to Cameroon, two commissioners to South Africa and New Guinea, and finally East Africa also was placed under a governor. The colonial companies, where they exist, are confined to commercial and colonizing activity. Officially these territories are still named protectorates, but this designation is not a happy one, because the protectorate is a conception of international law, and presupposes a state to be protected, as was formerly the Republic of the Ionian Islands, or as are now the provinces of the native princes of India, whilst in New Guinea and Africa there did not exist any state-like organization nor fixed frontiers. On April 1, 1890, a colonial

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

department was created at Berlin, being under the secretary for foreign affairs in all international questions, but independent in all internal colonial questions. It is supplemented by a colonial council with deliberative vote, to be heard in all questions of importance. In these regions the German emperor exercises full sovereignty. They are substantially colonies in the same sense as the British Crown colonies, forming an integral part of the empire as regards other states, although of course German laws are not applicable to them except by express enactment, and their natives are not German citizens. Within the last year this position of the German colonies has been clearly recognized and worked out.

A representative of the imperial authority is at the head of each colony with a staff of officials, exercising independent jurisdiction, and with an armed police force for maintaining order and protecting the territory against attacks from without. But in several instances this force has proved insufficient for its task. It was impossible to abandon their protection to the navy. Men-of-war might destroy refractory villages on the coast, but they could land only a small force of marines and sailors, and the navy has to perform other important duties in all parts of the world, and we could not afford to have several ships stationed at each colony. Besides, it is necessary to make a colony independent as to military protection, so that in case of war it may be able to defend itself and to establish fortified coaling stations, for neutral powers do not allow coaling to belligerents. It was necessary, therefore, to have in such territories as seemed to require it a small military force; and as it proved impossible to send out German soldiers to tropical regions, recourse was had to native ones of warlike condition under European officers, such as the Soudanese in East Africa and the Haussa negroes in Cameroon. This system has worked well, as the prompt suppression of Bushiri's insurrection by Major Wissmann amply proved.

Let us now take a rapid glance at the several German colonies. Great Namaqua Land, on the south-western coast of Africa, the first German colony, has hitherto proved of little value. The chief importance of the country for the future lies in its mines, and as yet none of great value has been discovered. The fact, however, that Anglo-Dutch companies have repeatedly offered a large price for them shows that with proper management they are likely to become productive. The South-West African Company was inclined to accept those offers, but the German government refused to sanction any sale to foreigners. It is different

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with Cameroon, situated on the Bay of Biafra, in the south-east corner of the Gulf of Guinea, which has good ports at Bota and the mouths of the Cameroon and Mungo rivers. Numerous factories, nearly all belonging to two large Hamburg firms, are established at Victoria, Hickory Town, Malimba, Bota, Benito, Batanga, and do a large business in palm oil, ivory, and india rubber. The climate is not uniformly healthy on account of the mangrove swamps on the rivers, but the colony has a sanitarium in the mountain range of Gamba, rising to 10,000 feet.

German East Africa affords a curious example how an adventurous enterprise may grow into an important colony. It will remain the uncontested merit of Dr. Peters that he laid its foundation by an expedition undertaken with slender means and by acquiring from independent chiefs a territory of about 3,000 square kilometres for the company of German colonizers who formed the nucleus of the present colony. Great progress has undoubtedly been made since the pacification of the country. Bagamoyo, destroyed by an insurrection, is to-day a city of more than 20,000 inhabitants; Dar-es-Salaam, the principal port, counts 10,000, and is fast increasing. Stations have been established in the interior, plantations founded, and roads built; a railway is planned, the navigation of the Rufiji is regulated, and the imports increased in one year by 170% ($248,590 to $682,817), a subsidized line of steamers connecting the colony with Germany. It appears that Dr. Peters has just now made a discovery which, if confirmed, will be of the greatest importance. According to his latest reports he has found immense strata of nitrate. Nitrate has hitherto nearly exclusively been drawn from north Chili, and this trade is completely monopolized by London firms. If the East African nitrate prove equal to that of Chili, it will bring about an enormous economical development of the colony.[1]

After an impartial consideration of the present state of German colonization, the great progress made within the last six years cannot be denied. True, the enthusiastic expectations aroused by the first steps have not been realized, and serious errors have been committed, followed by severe losses; but there is no reason for ridiculing the

[1] The other colonies are: Togoland, on the Slave-Coast, the exports of which exceed half a million dollars; the colonies between the Rio Congo and the Dubrecka River; the German possessions in Polynesia, consisting of Emperor William's Land, the northern and by far the most fertile part of New Guinea, and New Britannia Archipelago, a number of islands comprising about 40,000 square miles; and the Marshall, Brown, and Providence Islands.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whole enterprise and calling the newly-acquired possessions sand-deserts and fever-holes. Those who do so are at a loss to answer the question why England and other powers are so jealous of German trans-Atlantic expansion, and why the English lay such stress on their colonial possessions. The late Mr. W. E. Forster, in a meeting on imperial federation, 1885, observed: "The nations of Europe are finding out what it was for England to have large possessions in different regions of the world, and they are endeavoring to have their share of such possessions." We admit that none of the German colonies can be compared with India or Canada, but why are the English so bent upon enlarging their African and Polynesian colonies, which are in the same condition as the German? We have to plant the tree in order that our children may enjoy its fruit. For many years the British East India Company worked without profit, but the time of waiting was rewarded. Even after this short period of existence, the German colonies, with the exception of Damara Land, look decidedly hopeful; the exports to tropical West Africa range fourth in the lists of Hamburg exports, and the imports were, in 1889, $4,000,000.

The German trade with East Africa and Polynesia is rapidly increasing, although agriculture is still in its beginning. The colonies of Togo and Cameroon are already paying their expenses, and as soon as the native middlemen are set aside commerce and revenue will increase still more rapidly. This increase, of course, depends upon an intelligent policy, for the task of a colonizing state is twofold: it has to open new outlets to its own industry in the colonies, and to enable its citizens to draw from the colonies products better and cheaper than it is possible to get them in the general market; and, on the other hand, the mother-country takes the responsibility that this exchange shall not be prejudicial to the colonies, but shall prove equally advantageous to the colonists and to the home population. The welfare of the natives does not exclude, but in tropical countries even implies, a certain compulsion to work, as is shown by the example of Java, where a barbarous people has been civilized by the Dutch. If tropical Africa were left to itself, we should find in centuries to come no better development of its natural resources and its people, and their despotic misgovernment would persist in the same barbarous state which has existed from time immemorial. Negroes, Malays, and similar tribes can be educated to a higher standard only by labor, and this can be done only by the domination of a higher race, because the lower race has no conception of a development that shall turn to its

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

own profit. But that pressure must never degenerate into suppression, still less into slavery. Further, the governing class must abstain from anything which may lower the condition of the natives; and therefore it is, above all, necessary to restrain the sale of spirits, because brandy is the ruin of the negro. In East Africa that sale is prohibited, but in the western colonies matters are very bad in this respect. In 1889 more than one third of the imports consisted of spirits. A considerable import duty has now been put on this article; and it is to be hoped that the provisions of the Brussels Anti-Slavery Act of July 2, 1890, chapter 6, will suppress that evil. Good government, temperance, and labor are, however, not sufficient to raise the natives to a higher standard; morality and intelligence must be developed, and this can be done only by the missionary, who is the real pioneer of civilization. In this respect much remains to be done by Germany, for the voluntary contributions for this purpose are far behind those of England and the United States.

Large as the colonial programme is for the present German colonies, it is clear that they offer no outlet for the ever-growing surplus of the population of the mother country, because they are all situated in tropical regions. Germans may go to them as merchants, overseers, engineers, officials, but no European can do physical labor there. Agricultural colonies of the Caucasian race can prosper only in the temperate zone, and within that zone there are unfortunately no more territories without a master. As regards the flourishing German colonies in southern Brazil, it does not appear that the revolution which led to the establishment of the Republic has done any harm to them, but rather good. In late years, however, the Italian competition has become very active.

It has been proposed to direct the current of German emigration to the thinly-populated parts of Hungary, Poland, and the Balkan peninsula, and in former times this might have been possible; but at present with the nationalistic tendencies of these countries it is scarcely feasible. Hungary has a considerable German population, but it is ruthlessly oppressed by the government, which tries all means, fair and foul, to Magyarize the Germans, Slavs, and Roumanians. The same is the case with the numerous and flourishing German settlements in Russia, where their prosperity has evoked national jealousy, and Protestants and Catholics are persecuted in order to convert them to the orthodox creed, and a decree of October 1, 1890, forbids the sale of landed property to Germans. As to the Balkan States, German

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

commerce is rapidly increasing, but neither Servia nor Bulgaria would like extensive German settlements. It is different with Anatolia and Babylonia, once the richest of countries, but laid waste by Turkish misgovernment. These sparsely-peopled countries of immense extensions would offer a most favorable field for German emigration. They are not too hot for European laborers, and their ancient fertility might easily be re-established by reviving the system of irrigation of which Herodotus gives evidence and which made Pliny call the valley of the Tigris *fertilissimus ager totius orientis*. The probability of success is shown by the German Templar Colony in Palestine, which by its prosperity forms a flourishing oasis. Elaborate plans for such colonization have been published by an engineer, Pressel, for Anatolia, and by Dr. Sprenger for Babylonia, which show that millions of German emigrants may find room there for founding a new Germany. We strongly wish that the importance of this question should be recognized by the German government, and that it might be brought to exercise its great influence at Constantinople for inducing the Porte to favor the execution of this project, which might turn the wildernesses of Asiatic Turkey into a flourishing country and open resources of revenue which the Ottoman Empire sadly needs.

F. Heinrich Geffcken.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE FREE-TRADE TENDENCY OF WILLIAM II.

In the summer of 1891 I was enabled, through a series of happy combinations, to undertake a consecutive voyage down the Danube from the Black Forest to the Black Sea. For about 1,500 miles of the river my only means of progress was a canoe weighing eighty pounds net, in which I slept at night and made notes by day—sometimes paddling, but more frequently using my two sails. Progress under such conditions was comparatively slow—fifty miles a day was considered a good day's work—but it was none too slow for one looking at men and things from a canoe. The commercial or economic feature of this cruise was an object-lesson on the blessings of free trade. In Germany the Danube passes Baden, Bavaria, Wurtemberg, and Prussia, states which now trade freely one with the other, but which, before the imperial federation, supported four sets of customs officials in order to prevent the people from seeking their natural market.

At the Austrian frontier a tax was demanded and my passport examined. Here the question arose naturally: If it is well for Austria to shut out the commerce of Germany, is it not equally well that the States of the Mississippi Valley act in the same spirit, and that Louisiana protect itself against Illinois, Kentucky against Iowa? We settled that question long ago, and we hope forever. Europe has a river that is in many respects like the "Father of Waters," in that it forms a great and natural commercial path across Europe. Many independent states are along its banks, each strangely jealous of the other, and to-day each seeks to restrict rather than increase her commerce with the other river neighbors. Russia, Roumania, Servia, Bulgaria, and Hungary—each acts towards the rest as though commerce were an evil instead of a blessing. Thanks to my method of progression and to many other facilities for social intercourse, I was much struck by the extent to which the German language was used, as compared with the French. Many of my friends who had visited the lower Danube some ten years before assured me that I should find German of scant use after leaving Austria proper, and that if I did not learn the languages in current use I had better try French.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The German language in Hungary, as is well known, was boycotted after the revolution of '48, and there is still the same popular distrust of Austria's language amongst the Magyars of to-day as there is of "British free trade" amongst Irish-Americans. In spite of this, however, considerations of trade have prevailed; and as Germans are the best customers within reach of the Magyars, the trading class, at least, realize that their children must speak that tongue, as well as their own. Hence it is that on the Danube I never found myself in a place so small that I could not hold conversation in German, nor did I ever find a boat, a raft, or a dock that was not managed by some one speaking the tongue of "the fatherland." From Hungary to the Black Sea the German tongue fluctuated according to the volume of trade with western Europe and the intelligence of the individual. Even the proprietor of a water-mill in Bulgaria talked German with me, though his business was one that brought him in contact with only his own peasantry.

When Spaniards, French, English, and Indians contested for the Mississippi basin at the beginning of this century, the result was one which helps us to realize the deplorable consequences to commerce from division of control over such territory. The Danube must soon fall to the control of one power, the one whose language is most general, whose administration is most respected, whose civilization promises the greatest material development, whose government gives the best guaranty of stability and force. To-day nearly every enterprise on the Danube is managed or owned by Germans, from the floating bath at Galatz to the great engineering works at the Iron Gates. German capital is seeking investment along this line as fast as the conditions of the country promise security; the trading community is ready for closer communion with the west; and there is in every class a growing feeling that the prosperity of the Danube countries depends not merely upon the citizen of Austria-Hungary, but is bound up with the commercial policy of the German Empire. Therefore, it is not strange that from Vienna to Sulina anxious eyes should be directed towards Berlin—eager to know if the emperor takes much interest in the problem of "greater Germany" from a commercial standpoint.

Bismarck instructed William II. in political economy. No politician of modern times has had a better opportunity of influencing the spread of protectionism than the late chancellor of the German Empire. His instruction was given at the particular request of the pupil's venerable grandfather, the late William I. It was begun with genuine reluc-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tance on the tutor's part, for the chancellor was very busy, the pupil very young, and considering the then magnificent health of the Crown Prince Frederic, there was no reason to think that the present emperor would come into power until far into the next century. The young prince enjoyed his course hugely—as who would not with such a teacher? Youth admires the didactic professor, and the man who for a quarter of a century had by turns cajoled and bullied nearly every cabinet in Europe seemed eminently suited to impress the imagination of a youth strong in enthusiasm, but lacking the experience on which strong purposes are based.

The crown prince's tutor before attending the course of "Professor" Bismarck had been a gentleman universally respected for the purity of his character and for the many philanthropic efforts associated with his name. Of course, I refer to Dr. Hinzpeter. One day the doctor showed me over a most interesting charitable institution and incidentally dwelt upon the force of great ideas in producing noble results. He deplored the money-making tendency of America and asserted, much to my amazement, that my country had not furnished a single idea of value to humanity. Of course I protested—thinking immediately of Franklin, Fulton, Morse, and Edison, to say nothing of several men of letters and statesmen whom I had been taught to venerate. Before I could formulate a reply, however, Dr. Hinzpeter halted and said: "Stop. Yes, you have produced one great man—one grand idea—Carey!" At this unexpected proposition I looked closely at the learned doctor to discover if he was perpetrating a joke at so serious a moment. I satisfied myself that he was not, and that he referred to the late Henry Charles Carey, of Philadelphia, the so-called "Father of American Protectionism," and the author of many works, none of which has ever been regarded as a contribution to political science by any economist of repute.

When the present emperor came to the throne it was almost a criminal offence to question Bismarckism in any form. George von Bunsen had been prosecuted for venturing to make a speech to his constituents in opposition to the tax on breadstuffs; a law was in existence giving the police extraordinary powers of search and arrest, nominally to overawe socialists, but practically to intimidate all who were not Bismarckian; the very universities had become so infected with a nondescript doctrine of Bismarckian state socialism and paternal protectionism that it is no exaggeration to say that political economy as a science had ceased to exist in Germany. The personal power of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Bismarck had reached such proportions that questions of every kind, from theology to pork-packing, were solved by a determination of what was or was not Bismarckian. The advancement of every man in Germany seemed to depend upon loyalty to Bismarck's teaching. In a country where beneficiaries of the government represent nearly ten per cent of the population, a prime minister is sure of a strong vote of support; but in the case of Bismarck he had not only all this, but also an enormous prestige from the boldness with which he had caused himself to be regarded as the author of the German Empire.

The new emperor on mounting the throne was, of course, expected to sustain the policy of a minister whom his grandfather had honored with every mark that a loyal subject or even a money-loving one could ask. The reign of Frederic III., less than an hundred days, had been too short and too full of physical suffering to let the world know the strength and breadth of the ruler whom Bismarck next appeared to represent. In his successor the Germans have an emperor who has not only abundant physical energy and endurance, but has with it a contempt for humbug, socialism, and the crooked police methods that always suggest a feeble or rotten executive. He is a practical manager and does not pretend to be a savior of society. He has no quack nostrum for poverty, crime, prostitution, or the discontent that sets class against class. His business is to see that the government machine runs smoothly, that competent men are employed, that the people's taxes are spent for the public good, that the law is administered without favor, and that reforms are inquired into. He has the mind of a Yankee; he loves experiment; his methods are direct. He is the sort of man that forges to the front in a new country. I can imagine him learning his trade in some machine-shop, then rapidly rising to a position where inventive talent, thoroughness, patience, and, above all, honesty tell—say, at the head of some great manufacturing or ship-building enterprise.

On his succession to power, in 1888, he did what most intelligent young men do when suddenly placed in charge of an estate. He inquired how the previous manager had done his work; he examined personally into cases of alleged wrong; he noted carefully the testimony of qualified observers; his eyes were opened to the need of reform in many directions; he suggested these reforms to his manager; the manager did not agree with the master; the manager resigned and now spends his time in embarrassing as far as he can the movements of the manager who has superseded him. The immediate cause of Bismarck's resignation will be known when the emperor chooses to make the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

matter public. To-day we can regard only the official acts of the minister, and from these infer what reason there was for his being retired.

Let us suppose Bismarck in soliloquy when he is frank with himself. Would he not say something like this? "I have ruled the people of Germany for twenty years. I have taught them that protectionism is the right policy, and I have tried to lock up all who disagreed with me. I have increased the cost of the workingman's food in order to benefit the landed proprietor who wants high prices for his wheat and hogs. I, too, am a landed proprietor, but that is immaterial. My protectionism has been logical. When the working people grumbled because I taxed their dinners, I told them that the government would provide for them in old age and help them when they were hurt. Strange to say, the people were not even then satisfied, for they found that I had docked their wages in order to create my insurance fund, and they preferred their own private and independent insurance to the one associated with Bismarckian methods. Socialism has constantly increased since I have been in power. At the first imperial election the socialist votes cast were only about 100,000, and at the last they were over 1,000,000. That is odd, for I have set the police on the discontented as severely as possible. I have broken up meetings, confiscated printing presses, imprisoned agitators, and done everything in my power to protect the country from heresy. I am also mortified to note that my stern measures on the French frontier have not made those people love me. I have done my best to harass the people in the Polish part of Prussia, but even they detest me and grow more Polish every day. While I have always tried to snub Austria and England and make friends with Russia, the czar is constantly moving his troops against the German frontier and evidently means war. In short, I have made a mess of my stewardship."

Bismarck, of course, did not use this language, and perhaps never will. But recent events indicate that the emperor is not blind to the dangers into which Bismarckism with its socialistic protectionism has been hurrying the country. When he ascended the throne one of his first acts was to drop the policy of hounding the socialists. He recognized in socialism the manifestations of a discontented and cranky state of mind which could be cured, not so much by police bludgeons as by public sentiment and healthy discussion. It is gratifying to note that with the dismissal of Bismarck socialism appears to have lost half its vitality. Socialism and protectionism spring from the notion that the state understands the management of private affairs better than the in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dividuals immediately concerned, and it is rare for a man to absorb one heresy without soon tolerating the other. This is illustrated by the hatred with which the socialists in Germany regard the "*Freisinnige*" party and its organ "*Die Nation*," mainly because they are opposed to protection. The same hatred is here shown towards Henry George by trades-unions, protectionists, socialists, and other visionary or selfish people who dream of a community happy in its power to shut out all but their fortunate selves. The emperor has given the protectionists of his country much offence by insisting that the burden of taxation shall be equally distributed, that the people in one industry shall not be protected at the expense of another. He has broken through a thick cloud of prejudice created by official efforts, and has led the way towards closer commercial relations with his neighbors.

The friendship which he feels for America is well known and springs from intimate acquaintance with our best workers. We have to thank this feeling and not the spirit of protectionism for the fact that to-day Germany admits American pork into the country—a food product which Bismarck was the means of excluding. The emperor has reached out the hand of friendship and commerce to his country's traditional enemy, Austria; he has broken down the barriers of prejudice which have separated these countries for centuries, and has, contrary to the teachings of his late chancellor, made of these two empires a friendly federation of sovereign states. It is too much to say that Austria and Germany trade as freely as two States of our country; but I do not hesitate to assert that the manner in which the German emperor has inaugurated and carried forward the present commercial policy towards Austria and Italy will not only extend the blessings of comparative free trade over a larger area than it has ever before covered in Europe, but that this move represents the first honest step towards making disarmament possible. He has drawn together by bonds more sure than dynastic affinities at least three countries. These countries will find, as do our States, that the freer the trade with one another the better for all concerned, and that the best guarantee of peace is community of interest.

The emperor has brought into one friendly federation more than half a million square miles of country, and over one hundred millions of people. He has encouraged commercial intercourse between the semi-tropical groves of Sicily and the amber coasts of the Baltic; from the iron mines of Westphalia to the cattle ranges of the Magyar kingdom. Nor can we think that his great economic reform can stop here. Between Hungary and the Black Sea are three agricultural countries,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Roumania, Servia, and Bulgaria, with over 100,000 square miles of territory and more than 10,000,000 industrious people. They want to sell their farm products and need manufactured goods in return. The great Danube is a natural highway connecting them with Germany and civilization; the trade along this stream is largely done by Germans, and would soon swell to respectable proportions if any government could promise them security. But satisfactory commercial progress is out of the question in a country where the government cannot command the respect of its neighbors; and so long as it is doubtful whether Russia is to have Constantinople, so long will the states of the lower Danube remain a comparative wilderness.

Roumanians and Bulgarians expect a Russian advance across their territories, and are turning tentatively towards Germany for assistance. The Danube in Europe is what the Mississippi was to us in 1803. We could not permit Napoleon to hold the mouth of that stream even then when her commerce was a mere trifle. We should assuredly have fought for its possession had France declined to part with it peacefully. The benefits that may be expected to result from the emperor's new commercial policy will in time become so apparent that the states of the lower Danube will seek to share them. The effect will be to draw together all the people along the 1,800 miles of that great river, from the Black Forest to the Black Sea, a dozen States whose alliance would be as close as that of our people between Minneapolis and New Orleans. That will be a fitting time to give Russia a distinct notice that her road to Constantinople cannot cross the German's Mississippi.

The Eastern question has so long been accepted as incapable of solution, that to apply to it a dose from the pharmacopœia of Cobden may seem at first sight utopian. But homœopathic doses have done wonders in many obstinate cases; kindness combined with firmness has done in two years what Bismarck failed to do in twenty. And who can say that the generous commercial policy now uniting Austria and Germany will not animate in the near future other states, and hasten the day of "peace, good will, free trade, amongst nations"? Whatever the result may be, let us at least be grateful to William II. for being the first to reject the mediæval doctrine that nations prosper in proportion to the harm they inflict upon their neighbors.

POULTNEY BIGELOW.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LEARNING OF LANGUAGES.

THE most striking contrast between ancient and modern education is in the time spent in the acquisition of foreign languages, either what are called dead languages, that is, those which have ceased to be spoken in the form at least in which we study them, or living languages, by which we understand the tongues that we study in their most modern form, as they are spoken by our own contemporaries. The burden of linguistic knowledge required in the cultivated classes has become heavier and heavier with the advance of time. Much of it is due to the idea that without the study of foreign languages a man or woman cannot have a cultivated mind, and also to the other idea that we cannot profit by books that we read only in translations. These are the two ideas that have mainly governed linguistic education in modern times. The invention of railways and steam vessels and the increased facility of travel which they afford have led many people to study modern languages with a view to travel and to social intercourse with foreigners. These motives are not accepted without some curious inconsistencies.

We are taught that foreign tongues, especially the dead languages, are necessary implements of culture. At the same time the ancient Greeks are held before us as the model race, the most cultivated race that ever existed, intellectually and æsthetically as superior to ourselves as we are to untrained savages. We are not without some evidence of the kind of education that prevailed in ancient Greece. Some of this evidence is of a positive kind, and the rest, very easily overlooked but equally significant, is negative. The positive evidence gives an account of the mental and physical training most valued by the greatest philosophers and by the authorities who directed education. It included chiefly what Plato called music and gymnastics, or what we should call intellectual and æsthetic culture for the mind and regulated exercises for the body. The mental culture appears to have been attained by poetry, philosophy, music, some natural science so far as it then existed, and by a certain degree of initiation into the fine arts. In our own time we believe that the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

study of languages is in itself an excellent and almost indispensable mental discipline. We find no trace of this belief in Greek antiquity. If we could ask Plato what was the best training for a youth of fortune and ability, he would answer that it was to hear wise discourses on the good and the beautiful, to learn poetry, to open the mind to science and the fine arts. He would not say that it was to learn many words for one thing.

Another inconsistency in our present estimate of the necessity of languages is that whilst the clergy, as educators, insist upon the necessity for studying ancient books in the original tongues, they so rarely, in their own practice, apply this principle to the books of the Old Testament. Taking together the whole of the European churches, it may be doubted whether the number of clergy who have read the Old Testament in the original reaches the low figure of one per cent. English newspapers ridiculed poor M. Guy de Maupassant for having written confidently on English poetry without having learned our language; yet our theological expositors do the same for Hebrew literature which is of much greater religious importance. In both cases translations are talked about as if they were originals. It is like criticising pictures from engravings.

The ancient Romans of the most cultivated time were students of Hellenic literature, but I am not aware that they attached, as we do, great special importance to linguistic study on its own account. They thought more of eloquence than of erudition. Their linguistic education would be like that of an Englishman who knows French well enough to read it and sometimes speaks it. Oxford graduates would look upon that as a very insufficient education. In the Middle Ages languages were scantily and imperfect studied. Laymen could rarely write even their own language, and ecclesiastics had a familiar but uncritical and inelegant knowledge of Latin.[1] Our own conception of languages as an important, if not the most important, part of education has come to us from the Renaissance and is Italian in its origin. The idea prevalent in England during the nineteenth century has been that a man of culture must be able to read Greek and Latin, especially Greek, a knowledge of Latin being almost taken for

[1] One of the best proofs that an elaborate linguistic education is not indispensably necessary to the development of intelligence may be found in the constructive and decorative arts of the Middle Ages, in the admirable conceptions of architects who could not spell, and in the unsurpassed workmanship of craftsmen who could not read.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

granted. Men of letters in England are now expected to read two or three modern languages. In France the pretensions are much lower. The educated Frenchman is supposed to know Latin and a little Greek, with the rudiments of German and English.

The facilities afforded by good grammars and dictionaries, as well as by other philological works, make it incomparably easier for us to learn foreign languages than it could possibly have been for the ancients or the students of the Middle Ages. The claims upon us have increased with these facilities; indeed, the demands upon the time and attention of students have gone beyond the facilities themselves. Not only languages, but sciences and arts, put in claims that life is too short to satisfy, and there are already signs of a disposition to lessen the burden by diminishing the study of languages, particularly by the abandonment of Greek. It is probable that we ourselves have seen the extreme of language-learning as a part of education, and that the next century will find relief either in the intentionally partial acquisition of some languages or in removing them from the programme of studies.

The present state of linguistic education gives the most unsatisfactory results. Languages are first very laboriously and very imperfectly learned and then generally abandoned in after-life. Even the learned themselves rarely pursue them unless they have some special reason for doing so connected with their professional business. Modern languages are neglected almost as much as the ancient when they are not wanted for business purposes or travel. An Oxford man who is a ripe Italian scholar tells me that young ladies in England invariably give up their Italian after leaving school, as young men throw aside their Latin. University degrees are evidence of past labor, but not of interest, affection, or facility. Lord Dufferin said that although he had taken a degree he could not really read Greek until he had learned it over again for himself, and in his own way. An English judge who had taken his degree at Cambridge told me that he could not make out Greek in mature life even with the help of the lexicon. A fellow of the French university, a prizeman specially for Latin in a severe competitive examination, told me that he should never think of reading Latin for his pleasure—he did not know it well enough. An English professor, reputed to be one of the best Latin scholars in his own country, gave up Latin and Greek entirely when he turned his attention to modern languages. The principal of a French college once confessed to me that he never read Latin or Greek,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which were taught in the place by the specialist masters under him. All these were what are called "learned men," certainly educated men. What, therefore, are we to expect from the half-educated?

The neglect of languages over which years of painful labor have been spent admits, I believe, of a very simple explanation. The languages, in these cases, have been learned, but only learned, and this is not enough—they have neither been assimilated nor mastered. There are three stages in the acquisition of a language: scholarship, assimilation, and mastery. According to the commonly received notions on the subject, scholarship is everything, a mistake that leads to continual disappointment. Let us consider the three separately.

I. Scholarship. This includes the different sciences concerning a language and also a knowledge of its literature. The sciences are grammar, etymology, prosody, and a sufficient vocabulary to supply the necessary material. Lord Dufferin believes that our education in languages fails chiefly from the want of a sufficient vocabulary, that we are stopped in reading chiefly by our ignorance of words. Educators have usually given the first importance to grammar, trusting to practice for the gradual increase of the vocabulary. A few reformers have argued that grammar, instead of being learned at the beginning, should be deferred as much as is practically possible until there is a supply of material, in the shape of words and phrases, in the mind.

The happiest condition of mind for the early stages of scholarship, and one of the most favorable for the later stages also, is that of the philologist, the lover of words, who takes an interest in words themselves, in their history, and in the shades of meaning which have belonged to them. If to this passion for words the student can add a liking for comparative grammar, he has the advantage that his study of a language is interesting to him at once, from the very beginning; whereas if he takes no interest in philology and grammar and has to fight his way to the enjoyment of literature, he may toil for long years without reward. The true philologist, like the grammarian, has the scientific temper of mind which values every fact and finds in each fresh discovery, however apparently unimportant, the payment of a separate satisfaction. In this way he goes on accumulating his vocabulary with the same interest that a mineralogist has in collecting specimens.

Unfortunately, this philological instinct is rare in boys and young men, whilst from the minds of women it is almost invariably absent. The changes in letters with which a very little etymological learning

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

familiarizes us appear to them an arbitrary invention of pedants, made only to prove their theories, and with which any theory may be proved. I have known many women who valued beauty, grace, and elegance in language, but I never met with one who cared in the least about its scientific history. If you tell a lady that *episcopus*, *bishop*, *vescovo*, and *évêque* have not only the same meaning but are strictly and literally the same word in the sense that the letters have undergone no changes except those according to well-known laws, she will think that your learning is a vain deception, that the words are obviously different, and that as to their origin, it is idle to inquire about it. If you add that *bishop* only means *overseer*, she will think that you wish to lower the episcopal dignity. If you say that *choose*, in its origin, means only to *see*, she will consider such information useless; as when she chooses a ribbon she selects it—she not only sees, but takes it out of preference. It has been argued, also, that a knowledge of etymology actually perverts our estimate of words as they are used at the present day; and that to employ them exclusively in their present sense, as women invariably do, is better than it is to confuse the mind with disturbing reminiscences of their history. The most formidable of all arguments against scholarship is the undeniable fact that women often speak elegantly and fluently, using an extensive vocabulary, with scarcely any scholarship at all. To this it may be answered that there is no instance of a woman who has written correctly without educational drill. In France there is no more amusing contrast than that between the voluble spoken French and the rare, incoherent, ill-spelt written French of half-educated women.

Another argument against the necessity for scholarship is the case of bi-linguals who know two languages without having scientifically studied them. The true bi-lingual is one who has used two languages from his infancy, and so gained a practical familiarity with both that is almost unattainable in later life. It does not, however, follow that familiar knowledge is either profound or extensive knowledge. As the subject interests me, I have taken every opportunity of observing and questioning bi-linguals, and have come to the conclusion that without scholarly training their vocabulary is always very limited. The Scottish Highlanders speak English creditably for people of limited opportunities, but they know very few words. I found the case to be the same in the Morvan (an east-central district of France), where the peasants speak remarkably pure French when they speak it at all; but it is very limited French, although no one but a careful observer

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would suspect the real narrowness of its limitations. When I once complimented my gardener on the purity of his French, he smiled and said it might be pure as far as it went, but there was "very little of it." In these cases it is the absence of hesitation that deceives us. The speaker has a very limited vocabulary always ready, but he himself knows how limited it is when he undertakes to read and is stopped in every line. The case becomes even worse when a half-educated bi-lingual attempts to use language beyond his real knowledge and capacity. Abundant examples of this are supplied by the more or less anglicized inhabitants of British India. The Morvandeau is too wary to venture upon grandiloquent French; the British-Indian has an imprudent preference for fine English.

There are differences amongst languages as to the requirement of scholarship. When the grammar is complicated, no uneducated or half-educated native can avoid error; when it is simple, as English grammar is, a naturally clever person hides ignorance more easily by imitating the better educated.[1] In France the half-educated have a great dread of writing, as the pen always betrays them. The ladies of the last century had not this terror before their eyes, because in those days there was a liberty of ignorance that no longer exists. Without scholarship we either do not understand or, what is worse, we misunderstand a number of terms and expressions that are in common use amongst the highly educated, and not used by them from affectation, but from necessity, because the ideas belonging to high culture cannot be expressed without them. The result is that without scholarship we are shut out of cultivated society in a peculiar way; that is, we may be admitted into it as children are, yet excluded, like children, from its serious thought. Hence the uselessness of unscholarly acquisition for purposes of intellectual intercourse. It is available for the common purposes of travel, but not for the kind of conversation that an intelligent man travels far to seek.

I remember a foreigner who spoke admirably in his own language and whose conversation in that language was extremely interesting. He had a liking for French society, but his knowledge of French was in the highest degree inaccurate and unscholarly, so that he could not take his due share in conversation; and although he knew some eminent Frenchmen, and was personally liked by them, he must have given them a most inadequate idea of his abilities. If his French sentences

[1] No uneducated Frenchman can use the invaluable conjunctive pronoun *dont*.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

could have been taken down exactly as he spoke them, word for word, and so printed, every line would have contained several gross blunders. And when we reflect that he was accustomed to deliver French of that quality to ears so sensitive that the mere misplacing or omission of an accent struck them as something almost intolerable, we understand what French politeness really is.

Having fully admitted the necessity of scholarship, particularly for writing and for social intercourse with cultivated persons, I have now to add that scholarship, by itself, can never lead to mastery, and that the commonest cause of disappointment in the learning of languages is to expect from it powers and facilities that it never has given and never can give. Scholarship does not even give the power of *reading* in the true meaning of the word. It enables us to construe, to explain the construction of passages, but not to read, as we read English. The verb "to read" as used by students contains a flattering over-estimate of their own powers. They say they are "reading" Latin and Greek when the process is quite of a different kind. In reading we see the sense of a passage at a glance and appreciate the value of every word. We feel the effect of the passage as a whole, yet at the same time we perceive the significance of every detail. The scientific analysis of passages is not the reception and appreciation of literature; it is one of the varieties of anatomy. One cannot be thinking about grammar and literature at the same time.

The best evidence of the insufficiency of scholarship is that it never enables the pupil either to speak a foreign language or to write it with real facility. There are eminent Frenchmen whose knowledge of English is scholarly and nothing else, and they can neither speak English nor understand it when it is spoken. Their knowledge of English is dead; they have anatomized the language as if it were a corpse. No living Englishman would attach the slightest importance to their opinions about our literature. Not being able to pronounce our language, they can neither appreciate the melodies and harmonies of English verse, nor the cadences of English prose. One of my sons attended a lecture on "The Merchant of Venice" given in Paris by a famous French authority on the English language. As the lecturer could not pronounce English, and did not know on what syllables our tonic accent fell, he had invented the most ingenious theories to account for the construction of Shakespeare's verses, not as we should read them, but as he read them himself. Here is a single instance. The learned lecturer pronounced the second syllable in *Venice* like the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

adjective *nice* and passed over the first letter *e*, so transforming the word to "Vnīce." Fancy how Byron's lines would read under such treatment!

"O Vnīce, Vnīce, when thy marble halls
Are level with the waters," etc.

I have often seriously and unaffectedly doubted whether the scholarly knowledge of languages, taken by itself, was of any real value or use. For some years I believed it to be of the same value as a knowledge of heraldry or numismatics; that is, something to interest a curious or occupy a vacant mind. My present opinion is that scholarship, by itself, is of some practical use in making us independent of untrustworthy translators. There are two opinions about the habit of reading translations. One eminent writer says that however laboriously we puzzle out an authentic original text with a dictionary, it is still far better for us than any translation can be. Another eminent writer and scholar told me that in his opinion it was a waste of effort to make out any difficult original when translators have done the work; it was like hewing one's way through a forest when there is a good road in the same direction. I admit that even moderate scholarship is of great literary use in enabling one to see whether the translator's expressions are to be found in the original or not. If we have not at least scholarship enough to refer to the original whenever a doubt arises, we are utterly at the mercy of translators; that is, of a most unscrupulous class of men who put the living author on a bed of Procrustes, elongating or mutilating at their convenience. There are also many books, useful at least for historical reference, of which no complete translation exists.

If a student has a natural taste for grammar and philology, he will work patiently at difficult texts in languages he can never hope to master; but if his natural gift is for literature, as literature, he will be impatient of the slow and difficult labor, and turn for his reading to some language that he really possesses, nearly always his own. It therefore happens that the love of reading, instead of being an incentive to the acquisition of linguistic science, acts as a deterrent. The philologist goes to his dictionary as to an interesting museum; the reader thinks of every reference to it as an interruption.

The literary rewards of scholarship are few. I never have met a foreign scholar who could appreciate English poetry. In moods of perfect candor, foreign scholars confess honestly that they cannot hear any music in the most musical English verse, that it seems to them

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

only prose in a metrical form, and that even its prosody is unintelligible. As professors, they sometimes criticise our poets with results like the following, from a French edition of "Childe Harold," with numerous and profoundly learned notes:

> "There sunk the greastest,[1] nor the worst of men
> Whose spirit, antithetically mixt,
> One moment of the mightiest and again
> On little objects with like firmness fixt;"

"Il semble que *the mightiest objects* étant régi par le verbe *fixt* (pour fixed) la préposition qui convenait ici n'était pas *of*, mais *on*, comme dans le second membre de la phrase (*on little objects*). Toutes les éditions portent cependant la préposition *of*."

There is no blundering so delightful as learned blundering. Imagine the advantages of French boys with this edition in their hands! The concluding sentence about *toutes les éditions* is delicious.

I never met a Frenchman who had either mastered English or gained any vital knowledge of the language by the methods of scholarship alone, and I never met with an Englishman who by "sound learning" had gained any clear sense of the delicacy and appropriateness of French expression. Yet these modern languages are said to be easy in comparison with ancient Greek, and if "sound learning" only leads, in their case, to a more or less elaborate kind of misunderstanding, it is hard to see how a knowledge of Greek, if acquired only by the same inadequate methods, can be much better.

II. Assimilation. The defect of scholarship is that, taken by itself, it does not insure assimilation. The language learned by grammar and dictionary does not become a part of ourselves. The assimilating power exists in the most various degrees, and is usually called "a talent for languages." The degree of assimilating power, in the same individual, may vary with the languages with which he has to deal. This brings us to the deepest and most mysterious of all questions concerning language—its adaptability to our mental needs. If the genius of a language answers to your own mental nature, you will assimilate it easily; if not, you could not assimilate it in a hundred years.[2]

[1] The misprint is in the French edition.

[2] Mentally running over a list of forty or fifty people known to me, I feel well able to divide them into those who might learn a foreign language if they would take the trouble, and those (the majority) who could not possibly learn one if they toiled till the crack of doom. The difference consists chiefly in the presence or absence of the assimilating power. Amongst Englishmen, I could name a dozen who might learn German well, but never French.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When there has been real assimilation it is proved by this, that the words and expressions seem to us perfectly natural and so closely connected with the things and ideas signified that we do not think of them, but only of what is meant by them. Language is a medium that becomes more and more transparent as it is more our own, and, when completely assimilated, language itself gives place to the thoughts and images which it evokes. If a language is too narrow for our needs, we never shall really assimilate it, because our minds will not be able to move easily and freely in its narrow space.[1] No cultivated modern mind would be able to move freely within the limits of ancient Hebrew. A modern Englishman needs a range equivalent to that of English. Still more difficult is it for a half-cultivated intellect to assimilate one of the great languages of modern culture. The uneducated Englishman gets only so much French or German as is suitable to an uneducated mind. In the learning of foreign languages no one can go beyond his tether. The utmost result of assimilation is to give us, in another tongue, the possibility of expressing ourselves fully. We can never express anything greater than ourselves.

When the mother-tongue is primitive and narrow, and consequently unsuited to the expression of advanced and complex thought and knowledge, culture is usually obtained through the medium of another language which is perfectly assimilated by use, and substitutes itself for the mother-tongue. A Scottish Highlander may use Gaelic in his father's cottage, but in the schools of Glasgow or Edinburgh he uses English because the sciences he has to acquire cannot be taught in Gaelic; and ever after, though he may talk to his father in Gaelic about the simple events of his native glen and its primitive interests of pastoral life and the chase, he will think in English about his studies. French has been adopted by the cultivated Russians for the same reason, and I see now that the Japanese students in Japan itself are inclining to the adoption of European languages, because the Japanese tongue is not sufficiently developed for their work. These cases of *forced* assimilation must occur frequently, as culture must necessarily find for itself an adequate expression and will take up a foreign language if the native one does not answer the purpose.

[1] This might, perhaps, be more precisely stated by saying that a narrow language may be assimilated by the sub-mind of a cultivated person, but not by his higher mind. I was at one time master of one of the most uncouth varieties of the Lancashire dialect, and could think in it for all very simple matters; but the moment my attention turned to anything connected with philosophy or the fine arts, I was forced to think in pure English or French.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The teaching of languages being usually confined to the methods of scholarship, with its partial success and persistent causes of failure, we may ask whether it would not be possible to produce assimilation by artificial means, to train the pupil in such a manner that the language shall become part of himself. The answer is that *if the language suited his idiosyncrasy he could do it for himself, but that no teacher could do it for him.* With a considerable appearance of industry, the great majority of learners do not in reality move themselves in the matter. They expect the master to do the work, whilst they are to be almost passive recipients. The consequence is that after dawdling over a language for eight or ten years, they can neither speak it nor write it, whilst even their reading can only be called reading by a polite fiction. Supposing, however, that a young student cared to assimilate a language really suited to his nature, I believe that Professor Blackie's method would be found the best. He recommended the learner to attach words to tangible or at least visible objects. If you are learning Greek, repeat the Greek name for every object in the presence of the thing itself and whilst you are looking at it. By so doing, you will associate the vocabulary with nature in your mind. We may also fasten expression to action by constantly saying to ourselves, in the foreign language, what we have just done or what we are going to do. It is good to keep a diary in the language we have to learn. In a word, if we desire to assimilate a language, we must make it a part of our life, and in most cases this is done only with the native tongue.

The degree of assimilation may be tested by the question: Do you ever find yourself using the foreign language involuntarily ? Do you think in it, or dream in it, or write it involuntarily? Mr. G. A. Sala, who is of Italian origin, writes English well, but says that he always thinks in Italian; in such a case English may be well known, but it is not completely assimilated. I have spoken of writing a foreign language involuntarily. What I mean is that if you have really assimilated a foreign language it may happen to you, as it has often happened to me, to make an entry in your note-book in the foreign tongue, quite unconsciously, or to write the first page of a letter in English and the second, after turning the leaf, with the same speed and unconsciousness in French or German as the case may be. It is a misfortune when a foreign tongue becomes in the least degree preponderant so as to impede the free use of the native language. That is too heavy a price to pay for any degree of linguistic attainment. Cavour

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spoke French better than Italian. He probably did most of his thinking in French. A very good test of assimilation is our *seriousness* in the use of a foreign language. If it seems to you slightly absurd, so that you cannot speak it without feeling like a comedian acting a ridiculous part in a play, you have not assimilated it. If you can talk in it seriously to a man on his death-bed, the probability is that there is real assimilation. Again, the language you will use when angry is always one that you have assimilated. Vulgar people with superficial refinement revert to vulgar expressions in their wrath. At such times accents will be heard again that the angry man has been at the greatest pains to correct.

Strong individuality in character is against assimilation unless it is accompanied by exceptional powers of mimicry. A famous Scotchman, certainly one of the most able men of his time, told me that he had never been able to learn a foreign language.[1] George Eliot had a rare power of acquiring languages for the purpose of reading, but could speak no language comfortably except her own. Disraeli never could speak French, and took an interpreter with him to Berlin. Bismarck is more of a linguist, but does not like too much perfection in the use of a foreign language, because it seems to denationalize a man. He says he does not like an Englishman who speaks French like a Frenchman, a misfortune little to be apprehended.

III. Mastery. So few people master their own tongue that it seems almost superfluous to consider the possibility of mastering any other. In the fine arts we do not call any one a master unless he has both power and facility in execution; the possession of knowledge is not enough. A musician must execute a rapid passage both rapidly and correctly at the same time—if it is marked *prestissimo*, he has to play it *prestissimo*. A painter is not a master unless, in addition to his knowledge, he has power of manual execution, the power that is called "handling." No one can be said to have mastered a language unless he can read, write, and speak it both rapidly and correctly; and not only correctly, but with the most varied and delicate shades of expression. The words should be the right words effectively placed and judiciously connected, pronounced, too, with just the degree of emphasis that lends them the intended degree of significance. There should be no hesitation, no going back to correct a faulty phrase, no

[1] There was no need for him to tell me this. I knew very well before that he was one of those persons, often very able in other ways, who cannot force their thoughts into the moulds of a foreign tongue.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

addition to complete an imperfect statement. The hearer listens to a master of language with delightful feelings of satisfaction.

In every country a few highly educated natives, with strong inborn gifts of utterance, attain this perfect skill. Their talk, at its best, is so superior to common talk that it seems almost a language of the gods. For a foreigner to try to rival them is as if a flute-player were to contend with Joachim on the violin. But the foreigner may at least try not to be slovenly; and if he tries at all, how seldom he succeeds! I have seen a statement in an English educational newspaper that any young lady can "master French" by spending a winter in Paris. Mastery, indeed! I could name an Englishwoman who has lived eighteen years in a French school, and has not yet been able to learn either the genders or the irregular verbs. I know just one lady, one only, who has the purest French of Paris for her Parisian guests, and the best of English for me. To hear her easy alternate use of the two languages, always without a fault, is one of the rarest of linguistic pleasures.[1]

One word in conclusion about the moral side of linguistic studies. Mr. Anthony Trollope called Greek the "pride-producing language." That can be only because our Greek scholars have no ancient Athenians to set them in their proper places. In modern languages there is never any room for pride. One of three things always happens: 1. You have poor opportunities and speak badly, a case neither for glory nor shame. 2. You have good opportunities and speak badly, in which case you ought to be ashamed of your laziness and inaccuracy. 3. You have extraordinary opportunities and speak well, a very rare case indeed; but then you can only compare yourself with the few whose opportunities have been equal to your own. The only temper that makes any linguistic acquirement possible is that of patient submission to endless correction; and as all young people detest correction and elderly ones take it as derogatory to their dignity, the rarity of the needful humility may be the true reason why languages are so carelessly studied and so imperfectly acquired.

P. G. HAMERTON.

[1] As some too clever reviewer may say that this is an allusion to Mrs. Hamerton, I may explain that it refers to another lady. This lady is English on her father's side and French on her mother's. She is the only person I ever have met who speaks the two languages in perfection. Being curious in these matters, I inquired whether both were equally easy to the speaker. She said, "No, I feel more at home in French."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REFORMATORY PRISONS AS SCHOOLS OF CRIME.

"THE stability of the state," says Solon, "rests upon two pillars: the first of these is punishment, and the second reward." All history and all scripture, sacred and profane, sustain the truth and wisdom of this axiom. But our prison reformers tell us that in this matter all history is misleading and all scripture mistaken; for, according to their view, we must remove the first of these supports and do away with punishment altogether.

Sixty-four years ago the great and good Sir Walter Scott, whose kindness of heart was never questioned, and whose position as clerk of a court gave him special opportunities for judging, wrote in his "Journal" of the first of prison reformers: "The philanthropy of Howard has risen to a pitch of insanity." "Yet," he adds, "without these extraordinary men prisons would have remained the same dungeons they were forty years ago. I do not see the propriety, however, of making them dandy places of detention. They should be a place of punishment, and this they can hardly be if men are better lodged and better fed than they were when at large." Our unselfish heroes of a single idea are doing great deeds and noble, with their eyes firmly fixed on the sorrows of the desolate, the outcast, and the oppressed. But let us more closely examine the new theory of our active reformers, as expressed in their recent public utterances.

First: the Rev. Philip Moxom, at a meeting of the association of philanthropic gentlemen known as the Massachusetts Prison Reform Association, announced that the person whom we have generally regarded as responsible for the crime he commits is not the real criminal. "Society is really responsible for his crime." Is not this dangerously near what Carlyle calls "the greatest calamity that can befall a nation," a "weakening of the righteous hatred of evil"? The Rev. Mr. Barnes, too, Chaplain of the Massachusetts State Prison, on the same occasion said: "The whole idea of our penal institutions seems to be radically wrong. A man is not sent to jail to be punished." This is the view lately promulgated also at the International Prison Reform Congress in Europe. Mr. Barnes adds: "The criminal, instead of being punished, should be taught moral and intellectual beau-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ties and refinements that he never dreamed of before." Mr. Warren F. Spalding, secretary of this association, believes that there are other and better methods than those which the Creator adopts to secure obedience to the natural laws of our being; for, unlike the Creator, who first warns and then punishes the breaker of His natural ordinances with ever-increasing severity, Mr. Spalding, speaking for the association, says: "We should not punish men for their crimes —punishment should be only that of instruction and elevation." It is undoubtedly true that instruction and elevation should be the end of all punishment; but to proclaim these the only means, not the end, is simply to put the cart before the horse. What are these means?

"If the prisoner has no trade, he must learn one; if he is illiterate, he must become studious; if a man of violent temper, he must control it; if lawless, he must learn to obey; if shiftless, he must learn habits of industry." It is the great and lasting glory of Massachusetts, ever in the vanguard of progress, that she has introduced these good things into her prison system. Had the prison reformer done nothing else for her, he would have deserved the everlasting gratitude of mankind. But other influences are included in his scheme of salvation. Let us now look at these, and from various sources gather what we can of their effects. Says the moral instructor at the Concord Reformatory: "Most remarkable innovations have here been made on prison customs, and very wonderful privileges granted." The late superintendent in his reports states what they are:

"Every Saturday afternoon is a half-holiday. . . . Base-ball clubs come from outside the prison to compete with the prisoners; base-ball, foot-ball, wrestling, leaping, and other sports fill the hours. On holidays (that is, when the whole day is given up to revelry) the schedule of games rivals the Caledonian Club on its great days. . . . The entertainment programme (on evenings other than holidays) includes classical music and minstrelsy, farce and comedy, dignified declamation and humorous recitation, the beguilements of the magician, the illusionist, and ventriloquist, calisthenics, the banjo and the bones. . . . We strive to give to the criminal all the physical, social, intellectual, and moral advantages that uncondemned persons have, and as nearly as possible bring them to them in the same way as to uncommitted persons—good quarters, excellent food in abundance, regular daily work, weekly out-of-door exercise, recreation, schools, library, societies, courses of lectures, entertainments, and religious exercises."

All this is to be found in Col. Tufts's official reports. In a late interview he reiterated it in these remarkable words:

"Mr. Andrews may talk as he pleases of our 'roast-beef' and 'bouquets'; but we do feed and we do entertain prisoners; we mean to do it, with the best

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

material that the market affords, whether for the mind, the body, or the soul. If these things are necessary to keep good people good, they are equally necessary to make bad people good."

The aim of this great-hearted man was of the loftiest. To have been associated with him was to have seen goodness; and his personal influence was an incalculable factor in his real success. Yet the question cannot but recur to the reader of his remarks and reports: If these things, which have always been regarded as the rewards of virtue and a life of industry, are made the results of committing a crime, will men be more likely to struggle to obtain them by a virtuous life of self-denying, honest labor outside the prison walls? One of the convict contributors to the prison paper at Elmira, looking from his well warmed and lighted room, before going to the savory dinner and agreeable evening entertainment awaiting him, contrasts his lot with that of the cold and hungry men, women, and children whose dreary hovels he sees from his window. And he answers our question with another, when he asks in view of this contrast: "Is goodness profitable?" Evidently he was not, as our reformers would have us believe, filled with serious doubts as to whether it was a profitable thing to lead a crooked life. Well may the moral instructor at Concord, listening to the talk of the prisoners at their society meetings, exclaim: "It seems to me that these men need some one to expose the way of God to them more perfectly."

Mr. Wm. Saunders, M.P., after a careful study of our American prisons, describes those in the Northern States as "a little paradise, where all the prisoner's earthly wants are anticipated. . . . He gets the best the country can produce." And a county commissioner of wide experience informs the present writer that he hardly ever knew a prisoner willing by his pardon to exchange these blessings of our houses of correction for the usual hard work of a farm. They have repeatedly declined a pardon offered them on such condition. The Howard Association, the prison-reform association of England which is carrying on the work of John Howard in a wiser and more conservative spirit, has lately issued a warning entitled "The Hotel and Collegiate Prisons of the United States," in which these pregnant suggestions are made:

"The whole class of criminals and vagrants in America are treated with a leniency which is positively cruel to the honest community, inasmuch as this course tends to remove the dread of evil and so withhold the stimulus to labor. It has been abundantly proved by European experience that it is dangerous to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

render crime attractive by rewarding its perpetrators with privileges not attainable by multitudes of honest toilers."

And Mr. Charles Dudley Warner, pointing out that this system "does not diminish the volume of crime," pertinently asks, "Why should it?" "What is the effect," asks the Howard Association, "of such prisons on the external community? This is the primary question; for the safety and welfare of the general community far outweigh in importance the interest of the individual." Mr. Tallack, the secretary of the association, in his admirable, extended work entitled "Penological and Preventative Principles," answers this question with a wealth of precept and example from the knowledge and experience of all nations, as well as with much kindness of heart and hard-headed common-sense of his own; and he shows beyond doubt that the system has always demoralized the community, and vastly overcrowded both jails and workhouses—a result we are now experiencing to our infinite cost.

Mr. Elijah C. Foster, in the December (1891) number of the FORUM, after denying the increase of crime, as distinguished from lesser offences, quotes the statement that there is "nothing more misleading than figures, except facts"—which he unwittingly illustrates in the same paragraph by setting down the population of Massachusetts in 1865 as 623,449 (it was 1,250,000), and by saying that drunkenness was not punished as a crime in 1840, a remark equally far from the fact. He says, however, that an analysis of the statistics of the "home guard of the army of criminals," as he calls those committed for short terms, "shows that more than one-half of them are what are known as 'repeaters,' professionals in petty crimes for revenue or for 'bed and board' in some comfortable jail or workhouse." "The number of these," he says, "is simply enormous and daily increasing." "The State," he adds, referring to habitual drunkards, coming to the same conclusion as the present writer, whom he was criticising, "should abandon its mild and ineffectual methods and regard this as the dangerous element that must be rigorously treated and disciplined." That is, in the words of a greater student of human nature than Mr. Foster, we "must be cruel, only to be kind."

I can hardly agree with Mr. Foster, however, that, if we enlarge the area from which we draw our facts beyond the region wherein the new influences are operative, we shall therefore arrive at a better knowledge of their action. Mr. Spalding, in the January (1892) number of the FORUM, confines his attention to this limited locality, but

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tries to break the force of statistics there found of the vast increase in the number of criminals, as also does Col. Tufts, by restricting the use of the word "crime" to half a dozen selected offences, which he calls "serious offences," placing all other offences, even though, like the great crime against the home, they by statutory provision reach the dignity of felonies, as misdemeanors of no serious import. He admits, however, that "we are being overwhelmed by a great tide of drunkenness and kindred vices." Thus Col. Tufts figures out that "serious offences" have even diminished—a conclusion which Mr. Frank B. Sanborn shows is wholly erroneous. Mr. Sanborn's life-long devotion to the charities of Massachusetts and intimate connection for three decades with her statistics, which he has done much to improve, enable him to speak with great authority. He says: "If, as Mr. Spalding claims, serious crime has diminished during the last quarter of a century, how does it happen that the number of persons held for serious crimes is now five times as many as it was twenty-five years ago, while the number of committals is only three times, the population, meanwhile, having about doubled?" Perhaps Mr. Spalding has not shown us the whole truth, since he not only selects offences, but selects single days, in selected years, for the purposes of his comparisons. This is an admirable method, if we wish to sustain a theory, not to arrive at ultimate truths. By this, which he tells us is the "enlightened" and "intelligent" method, confining his attention to prisoners actually in jail on these selected days, he discovers a great error in the statement that crime has increased fifty-fold in fifty years. According to his "intelligent" method, that increase is but seven-fold. It has not occurred to him that the number of convictions throughout the years is the true test, not persons happening to be in jail on a day when fewest prisoners are found there. Senate Document 15, Annual Report of the Attorney-General (Part 1, pp. 10, 11), gives the number of "criminal convictions in Massachusetts during the year 1837" as 852; and the similar report for the year 1889–90 as 71,999—a slight gain of eighty-four-and-a-half-fold. That is an increase of eight thousand four hundred and fifty per cent, while the population increased but three hundred per cent. The estimate of fifty-fold was made on a comparison of commitments only, throughout the year.

This is not as alarming as would appear, however, but useful as calling attention sharply to the subject. Mr. Spalding sees in this, not the uselessness of his method of selection, but a proof that the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

attorney-general must have used the term "convictions in Massachusetts" on one page really to mean a number of prisoners remaining in jail in a single day, and on another page of the same report to mean what he says, namely, "convictions in Massachusetts throughout the year." As similar periods show far greater differences, we can only conclude that the official report is as likely to be correct as Mr. Spalding's personal surmises as to what the figures ought to be. The value of his process is well illustrated in his "intelligent method" of dealing with percentages. Selecting days of years when crime, like the "grip," was, or was not, epidemic, and dividing the whole period into three unequal portions, an admitted increase of 673 per cent, less 300 allowed for increase of population, is made to figure as only 83 per cent, appearing as increases of 35, 29, and 19 per cent. This is an easy way of getting rid of an awkward balance of 290 per cent admitted, but not subsequently accounted for. The disappearance of counterfeiting, another point made, has a most cheering aspect till we remember that there is no longer any State currency to counterfeit and therefore nothing for the State courts to take cognizance of. So, too, the "skilful analysis," by which a decrease of the difference between the population in and out of jail at the rate of a hundred a decade from 1 in 800 to 1 in 400 (this Mr. Spalding thinks should have been called an increase) is made, at the same rate of progression of *minus* a hundred every decade, to extend over 19,000 years. Looking a little closer at this "simple computation," we find that the result is arrived at by setting down every person not unlucky enough to have been found in jail on his selected day as "virtuous." "Therefore there must still be 99,744 'virtuous' persons in every 100,000."

This is certainly clever, and most encouraging; but, unfortunately for our faith in the "virtue" which consists in not happening to be found in jail on September 30, the police commissioners report that in Boston last year one in ten of the entire population was arrested, and one in twenty-six throughout the State. That is, the population of Boston was decimated by arrest. Fortunately for the work of the world, however, and the hunger of many a needy family, these arrests did not all result in that latest ideal of the prison reformer, confinement of the bread-winners for indefinitely long periods under the elevating influence of "an essay, a song, a sonata, or a poem," to quote the words of the last report, for 1891. The years of imprisonment inflicted in Boston did aggregate, however, in this year alone the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enormous sum of 2,266½ years. This means an expense of more than $1,000,000 for teaching these persons the delights of enforced idleness, and the withdrawal of an amount of productive energy equal to 10,000,000 loaves of bread, which we thus took from hungry little mouths that might well wail against us. This is not cheering to a somewhat tender-hearted person who sits where he can daily see the misery that this system inflicts on the young and innocent; who day by day for twenty years has watched phalanx after phalanx of this "vast horde," this "overwhelming tide of vice," pass hopelessly onward; and who for twenty times has reviewed the last 300 days of this sickening history and compiled therefrom data which are not to him mere counters in a game of "now you see it and now you don't," but remembrances of tragedies whose pathos burns itself into the very soul. It may, however, enable one to speak almost as truly from "experience" as the cleverest editor or the most eloquent of preachers whose studies have not been drawn from life.

Let us now observe the most important factor in this terrible result. The late superintendent at Concord reported, as one of the special "reformative influences," and the same is true to a lesser extent of nearly all our prisons, that "the prisoners have the largest opportunity for sociality at meeting and recreation times, and many lesser opportunities for unrestricted talk." What is the effect of these "social advantages"? Remembering that evil communications always corrupt good manners, we shall not be surprised to find the prison commissioners raising the objection that "it gives a man with no propensity for crime an opportunity to associate for months with a large number of very undesirable acquaintances." Mrs. Johnson, the able superintendent of the woman's reformatory, reports that it must be abolished if she is to do the best work. Another prison official of long standing says that, because of this association, "the prisoner goes out better fitted for a life of crime than when he came in." He says: "What one does not know of the criminal art, the other does; they exchange views on the best way to do a piece of crooked work, and as soon as they are at liberty undertake a bigger job than ever before." Mr. Tallack happily compares this system to plunging a healthy man into a pest-house of lepers, and quotes a celebrated Scottish warden's remark: "You may as well expect to clean soiled linen by dousing it into a tub of filthy water." The great American prison reformer, Mr. Edward Livingstone, observes: "Every association of criminals will to a greater or less degree corrupt, but

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

can never reform." General Brinkerhoff, supported by the signatures of the whole State Board of Charities of Ohio, publishes an official pamphlet on this subject, which is entitled "Crime Schools at Public Expense." After giving the dictionary definition of the word "school" he proceeds:

"To establish a school for crime, therefore, requires teachers skilled in the theory and practice of crimes; pupils with inclination, opportunity, and leisure to learn, and a place of meeting together. All these requirements are provided and paid for by the public, in the erection, organization, and equipment of our county jails and city prisons; and it is difficult to conceive how a more efficient system for the education of criminals could be devised. There are always adepts here who have made crime a profession. To them nothing is more delightful than to communicate to others better than themselves, and so apt and entertaining are these teachers that they rarely fail to interest and influence their scholars. . . . The majority are old convicts and utterly irreclaimable. . . . For the most part they have themselves been educated in penal schools and emerged from reformatories. They profess a deep contrition whenever the chaplain approaches them, and express an intense desire to partake as often as possible of the sacramental wine."

In convincing proof of the truth of this picture, a letter from one such "professor" to his pupil has just been brought to the present writer's notice:

"As I lay in my bunk at night, Bill, I often think of the bully times we had up to old Uncle Tufts's hotel"—that is the way he characterizes the Massachusetts Reformatory—"and the gay larks we had there at the Y. M. C. A. meetings, putting our heads together, and getting up the high old rackets we have had since."

"To the instruction of teachers such as these," says General Brinkerhoff, "150,000 pupils are committed every year in the United States; and if we include city prisons and station-houses, the number will be more than doubled." These are the "reformatory" influences which we have substituted, as less degrading, for "God's healing ministers of pain," that "barbarous" method to whose beneficent influence, as the Dean of St. Paul's has lately pointed out, every great soul from Solomon to St. Paul, and from St. Paul to the Duke of Wellington, has, in his own person, borne assuring testimony.

Would our clever writers, talkers, and other theorists leave their dusty sanctums and flowery-wreathed pulpits, and sit, not for "A Day in Court" (as a recent writer entitles his article), but day after day for thousands of days, at the only door through which all, from the truant to the murderer, must pass and repass—that portal to an inferno more awful than the poet's dream—they would know the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

meaning of the heart-breaking tragedies which lie concealed beneath these counters with which they so lightly play. One who once passes this gateway to a hell of crime, may well read above it: "All hope abandon." The happy child, whose only fault is too great fondness for his boyish sport, comes here—to enter that new kindergarten of our school of crime which we call the Truant School. There he will be separated at once from all those blessed influences of even the humblest home, those ennobling associations and comradeships with better-bred, more ambitious fellow-students, all the thousand winds of heaven which breathe through the home and the school and mould the tender plant into forms as enduring as life itself—nay, far more enduring than any individual life; for we see the qualities, thus early formed, transmitted from generation to generation. There he begins his first experience of a penal institution, and returns, "considering himself a hardened criminal, looked up to by all his friends of similar tendencies as possessed of unusual courage and fortitude." These are the very words of the last official report of the masters in Boston to the School Committee, and one of them adds: "The faithful, efficient, and judicious truant officer for the past twenty-four years in this district says that he has known but two boys to be cured of truancy by such confinement." The single teacher may be good, but the instructors in vice are a hundred to one; and the young "tough" who has been on the most blood-curdling "rackets" is the adored hero and model. As these words are written, the daily paper brings the intelligence that the revolt at Deer Island was led by such a truant. "He that spareth his rod," says the Scripture, "hateth his son."

As the evidence is developed in court when our little lad returns again, we realize of which masters he has learned his lesson. Now he will graduate from this devil's kindergarten of vice into that primary school of crime which we call the Reform School, where he will "freely associate" with all the worst boys of the State between the ages of eight and fifteen. His paid instructors here will, no doubt, be of the best. Here, haply, too, he may be saved, by being at last restored to such other home than his own as the plaintive little child in the story sighed for—"a home with a little h." This, indeed, may save him if the fatal glamour of those bolder emprises, which he has learned from his unsalaried instructors, has not beforehand done its demoniac work. Their chances are here more than a hundred to one. If that enormous power of personal influence triumph, we may see

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

him graduate again into that grammar school which makes this matter of criminal association one of its principal "reformative" agents. As he goes "up to Uncle Tufts's hotel" we may watch him as he listens to some other returning convert remarking to the committing officer that he is "glad you did not keep us over Sunday in the lock-up, for now we shall be in time for the base-ball game and the fruit collation which we have here every Saturday." If you meet "our unfortunate young friend" some years later, in "our only punitive institution," the state prison, where, as Colonel Tufts and the chaplain say, he is "acquiring the tobacco habit at public expense," you may hear him repeat a remark made there by two such victims of our enlightened system: "If they had treated me half as hard at the reformatory as they do here, I should never have been here." Here the band comes out only for "dancing on the green" on Labor-Day or some other great festival, or the day after, if it rains; and the ladies send their "bouquets on the seventeenth of June." If your patience holds out (for the study of mankind is more discouraging than a skilful manipulation of statistics) you may, after he has learned this lesson, gather some instruction also about the reason why it is futile to rely on any ancient distinction between figures representing "crime" and figures representing "lesser offences"—the exploded *mala in se* and *mala prohibita* of the old-time lawyers. Our convict is no more a convert than he was a convert before to the beauty of holiness: but, as the literary prisoner at Elmira sagely remarked, "freedom has after all a charm," for which the most savory dinner or the "bulliest nigger minstrel show on earth" cannot quite compensate. So, now, "our unfortunate friend" prefers those lesser offences which will keep him out of "purely punitive institutions," and give him at briefer intervals freedom for debauchery when he tires of freedom from cold, freedom from hunger, freedom from the struggle for existence, all those luxuries of good quarters, excellent food in abundance, and, what Thackeray called "that ideal of happiness, to lie abed all day with a novel of Dumas." We learn, from trustworthy sources, that our friend will have a choice of Eugene Sue, Ouida, and other improving literature, if Dumas's historical romances prove too slow for so rapid an individual as our past-graduate professor of crime has become.

General Brinkerhoff, vouched for by the whole board of Ohio, tells you that this is the course of instruction which we now give to something over 300,000 hapless youths in a single year—"mostly young men or boys who have drifted into prison, not because they were

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

especially bad, but because of evil associations, neglected training, or in the exuberance of youthful spirits they have been led into the commission of some offence real or technical against the law." This is the "experience" which you will gain, not from meaningless and often imperfect statistics, but from the daily study of human lives. The writer recognizes with but too poignant sorrow the entire truth of General Brinkerhoff's yet more mournful picture; for we have been following but a sample instance from his hard-earned experience.

What is the remedy? One manifest dictate of common sense is, to cease acting on that most astounding principle of "penology" just given to the world, namely, that "he who is made comfortable in prison feels imprisonment more deeply than he who endures severity." In brief, let us cease offering rewards for crime and misdemeanor, such as millions of honest toilers have never been able to win by years of faithful labor—such rewards as make the prisoners not only question "if goodness be profitable," but make them even doubt if great criminal enterprises, which at least lead to renewed activity, are worth the while; such rewards as lead Superintendent Gerrich, of the public institutions in Boston, to write:

> "Boston provides better bed and board to-day than most of the prisoners ever had before. We cater for their trade; if they come once, they are generally sure to come again. We had a man die here last March who was serving his 136th sentence."

Three thousand four hundred and thirty-six persons recommitted from 6 to 15 times; 1,169 recommitted 16 to 30 times; 288 from 31 to 50 times, and 175 more than 50 times recommitted—these figures are their own commentary. They represent cases of drunkenness only. For the more serious offences against person and property, the figures are in like proportion: 399 recommitted for these "serious" offences to the House of Correction and Industry 3 times, and so on. Nothing but the sense of disgrace keeps out a yet vaster horde; and that, like the incentive to a woman's virtue, vanishes with the first experience.

These well-meaning gentlemen, with their theory that "he who is made comfortable in prison feels imprisonment more deeply than he who endures severity," have brought us to a condition where our jails are so immensely overcrowded that the greater part of the prisoners must be absolutely idle for want of space and work. They have a panacea which is called the "indeterminate sentence." This is the plan which, Mr. Spalding tells us, "fits the sentence not to the crime, but to the character"; the character being determined, not by sworn evidence in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

open court at the time of arrest as to the circumstances of the offence and the offender, but by the prisoner's obtaining "a certain number of good marks while in prison for conduct, industry, and proficiency in study." This is the system which removes the bread-winner from his family for an indefinite period, while this test of character is being applied. We learn from the last report that "under it the misdemeanant can, by his own accomplishment, be released from imprisonment in one-third the term for which he may be held; and he convicted of felony may, in like manner, effect his release in one-fifth of his term." That is to say, a clever man guilty of homicide may effect his release in much less time than a less keen young man whose only fault is that he has on two or three occasions overestimated the amount of stimulant which he could comfortably digest. As the prison commissioners report that the worst criminals are the cleverest and best prisoners, and that this system discharged a man who had served three terms in the state prisons of as many different States, with a shorter term than a drunkard who was "in no wise a person of criminal inclination," we are led to doubt its sovereign efficacy as an unfailing test of character. This prolonged withdrawal from all the influences of ambitious and better neighbors is joined to the altogether vicious system of association with the worst of criminals.

The experience of Great Britain which, after a prolonged season of what Sir Walter Scott aptly characterized as "the insanity of philanthropy," has returned to the scriptural and benign ministry of pain, and the experience of Delaware that has never forsaken the divine law of punishment, are highly instructive. The happy dwellers in those "benighted regions," with their 50 and 40 prisoners (constantly decreasing in number) to the 100,000 and almost empty jails, can be pardoned for smiling at the "barbarous" epithets we are fond of applying to them; for they recall our 256 prisoners to every 100,000, constantly increasing, and our enormously extended and yet constantly overcrowded jails. Their emptying prisons and constantly decreasing prison population (since, in the case of Enlgand, its return to saner methods) mean an increase of productive energy and a fostering of industrious habits which restore uncounted millions of loaves of bread to the innocent mouths whose cry we contemptuously disregard. The lesson we teach to hundreds of thousands yearly is summed up in that pregnant query of our literary convert at Elmira, "Does goodness pay?" This is instruction in the delights of laziness and crime. We reverse the wise old maxim *Pœna suos tenere debit actores*,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

et non alios, and punish not the guilty but the innocent, both by withdrawing the bread-winner from them for indefinite periods and by heaping on him luxuries and idleness for which the innocent and honest must pay. We are so tender-hearted towards the guilty that we "must only punish them by beauties and refinements that they have never dreamed of before," but we have no hesitation in fining the innocent large sums for the benefits we shower on his "unfortunate friend."

Now, the system of fines which our prison reformers are striving to abolish, though it sometimes worked hardship on the innocent, who paid the fine to keep the home together and the bread-winner at work, had this great merit: it compensated the State for the injury done the State, and brought the lesson sharply home to the person who did the injury that he had a duty towards the State, which protects us all. It had, too, the merit, no small one either, of encouraging industry, not idleness. It is based on that sound theory of the Roman law, the *obligatio ex delicto*, the obligation which common honesty and decency should impose on every criminal to pay for an injury. This, at least, if we must insist on being wiser than the Creator, is neither punishment nor cruelty, but a manifest lesson in fair dealing, as impressive for reformatory purposes as any enforced literary exercises yet devised by our too clever friends, or all the "classical music and minstrelsy" from Bach to Billy Wilson. Colonel Tufts and his chaplain have wisely and well pointed out, in their very last report, that "a large number might be much better dealt with without the intervention of a prison," and the examples of Belgium and France prove the truth of the remark. There, by what they call a "condition condemnation," the prisoner is released from court on giving surety to perform his obligation in a stated time, which may be extended, or the fine remitted in special cases when the case comes up at the expiration of the period fixed. If he cannot give sufficient assurance of his subsequent return, he may work off this fine on the public works under such surveillance as may be necessary to secure that result.

This form of "indeterminate sentence" has in England proved most valuable, and is applicable to every criminal but that wild beast of prey who, all agree, should be secured forever, beyond the possibility of transmitting his fatal inheritance. The reformers in Germany, who look with as much horror as our own upon the older methods of nature, admit that on this basis we may all agree. In case one is inclined to believe that the examples of Belgium, where, too,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they have wholly eliminated the crying evil of criminal association, and of France, cannot be any guide for our own more enlightened republic, the writer may, perhaps, be permitted to add that this system, so far as our "wiser" laws yet allow, has been in the practice of the court with which for the past fifteen years he has been connected. Nothing has more lightened the sense of misery with which he has been surrounded than the voluntary testimony, which has from time to time reached him, from persons who have been subjected to its influence, and from other sources, of its value as a reformative agent. It avoids that degradation of imprisonment which involves a loss of the sense of shame, as fatal as the loss of modesty in a woman. Mr. Pettigrove, the present able secretary of the Massachusetts Prison Commission, says that the introduction of this system is a cherished object of that board. By this means thousands may be kept among the helpful influences of the pure, the ambitious, and the good, instead of being surrounded by all that is most degrading in the way of personal example and pernicious precept. We shall thus, too, cease inflicting a needless punishment on the innocent and industrious, and at the same time inculcate a lesson in honesty of incalculable value. In this we have a test and formative agent of character far above the cleverest system of marks yet devised by mortal man, because it is in harmony with that law of labor which reveals the Deity in whom we live and move and have our being.

WILLIAM P. ANDREWS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SPEECH OF MONKEYS.

As our acquaintance with nature grows more intimate, some nameless force attracts us into closer terms of fellowship with all living creatures; the slender threads of vital synthesis unite into a net-work of consanguinity; the voice of generic antipathy becomes a feeble echo, and that great Sahara, spreading its waste across the plain of life, is dotted with oases of vital unities. The conditions of life in a great city are such that all intercourse with nature in her normal mood is cut off. Hence, to one thus reared, all animated nature is only a huge pantomime. But to one who has lived among the denizens of the field and forest life cannot be a mere panorama of dissolving views.

Have you ever travelled alone, through a strange, wild country? If so, you must have observed how your horse became attached to you, and how the feeling of attachment grew upon yourself until you felt a pleasure in his dumb society; even yet, perhaps, there is a thrill of pleasure when you recall the journey. The cavalry soldier who has spent the lonely hours of midnight on the outpost, watching the camp-fires of the enemy on the distant hills, and the lone courier daring the storm and having in charge, perhaps, the fate of an army—they can tell you what an honest love this is, although it is born of a sense of mutual dependence, which is only realized when relieved of the complex conditions of life in populous communities. Such have been my experiences, and on such occasions I have often wished that I could talk with my horse, and he seemed to reciprocate my desire to converse with him; indeed, we did in some way seem to exchange thoughts and understand each other. This is one of the many tributaries which, flowing into the current of my life's dream, have drifted me into the harbor of the "simian tongue," which is one of the bays along the coast of the great sea of speech. As my friendship with the simian race ripens into intimacy, I cannot but wonder all the more why man has so long remained a stranger to this kindred type of speech. I do not mean kindred in the sense of grammatical affinity or structural unity, but kindred in phonation and holophrasis. Surely the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

intellect of man is equal to the task of translating the sounds and signs of those inferior forms of speech, no matter how remote may be their degree of kinship.

Why should it be regarded as strange that monkeys talk? Do they not enjoy the senses and faculties of man in all things else? Then, why should speech be the one faculty withheld from them? They experience pain and pleasure, to express which they cry or laugh, just as man does. They see, hear, love, hate, think, and act by the same means and to the same end as man. If the voluntary sounds they make do not mean anything, why may those creatures not as well be dumb? If they do mean anything, let us determine what the meaning is. It is true their language is quite meagre, and adapted only to a low plane of life, but it may be the cytula from which all human speech proceeds, or it may be at least the inferior fruit borne upon the same great tree of speech.

In a former article I mentioned the name of Pedro, the little capuchin in the Washington collection, and stated that I had taken a fine record of him. We are still the best of friends, and when he sees me he screams and begs for me until I go to him, when he kisses me with all the affection of a child, and caresses me in a most devoted manner; he even cries for me, and shows every sign of an attachment which seems to have sprung from a sense of gratitude. He begs so hard for me not to leave him that I really regret to part from him when I have to do so. The record I have made of him is unusually good and gives me a great display of sounds. I held him in my hand while making the record, and placed the tube quite near his lips while he was talking. I study this record with special care and pleasure, because I know that it was addressed to me in person; and feeling that the little monk was talking so earnestly to me, trying to make me understand him, I am the more anxious to learn just what he really said to me.

A short time ago I borrowed from a dealer in Washington a little capuchin called Puck, and had him sent to my apartments, where I have a phonograph. I placed his cage in front of the horn which I had adjusted to the machine on which I had placed the record of my little friend Pedro. I concealed myself in an adjoining room, where I could watch the conduct of my subject through a small hole in the door, about one-eighth of an inch in diameter. I had a string attached to the lever of the machine, and drawn taut through a similar aperture in the door, so that I could start the machine at any desired mo-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment, and at the same time avoid attracting the attention of the monkey either by my presence or by allowing him to see anything move. After a time, when everything was quiet, I set the machine to work and treated him to a phonographic recital by little Pedro, whose chatter was distinctly delivered through the horn to Puck, and from his actions it was evident that he recognized it as the voice of one of his tribe. He looked at the horn in surprise, spoke a sound or two to it, glanced around the room, and again uttered a couple of sounds, as he retired from the horn, apparently somewhat afraid. Again the horn delivered some exclamations in a pure capuchin dialect, which Puck seemed to regard as sounds of much importance. He cautiously advanced and made a feeble response; but a quick, sharp sound from the horn seemed to startle him, and, failing to find any trace of a monkey, he seemed to regard the horn with some suspicion and scarcely ventured to answer any sound it made. When I had finished the record I entered the room again. This seemed to afford him some relief.

A little later I adjusted my apparatus for another trial, and at this time I also hung a small mirror, about seven inches square, just above the mouth of the horn. Then retiring again from the room I left him to examine his surroundings, when he soon discovered the new monkey in the glass, and began to caress and chatter to it. After a while I started the phonograph; and when the horn again delivered its simian speech, it seemed to disconcert and perplex Puck. He would look into the glass and then into the horn; he would then retire with a feeble grunt and a kind of inquisitive grin, showing his little white teeth, and acting as though he did not know whether to regard it as a joke or treat it as a grim and scientific fact. His voice and actions were exactly like those of a child declaring with its voice that it is not afraid, and betraying fear in every act, and finally blending its feelings into a genuine cry.

Again Puck would consult the mirror; but it was evident that he did not believe the monkey which he saw there was the one that was doing the talking. He repeatedly put his mouth up to the glass as if caressing it, and at the same time showed a grave suspicion and some concern about the one he heard in the horn, and tried to keep away from it as much as possible. This was a source of some surprise to me, as the sounds contained in the record were all uttered in a mood of anxious, earnest entreaty, which, to me, seemed to contain no sound of anger, warning, or alarm, and which in a collective and general way I had interpreted as a kind of love scene; but it must have been a gen-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

eral complaint against those monkeys in that other cage, who had made life a burden to little Pedro. One thing was evident, and that is that Puck interpreted the actions of the monkey he saw in the glass in one way, and the sounds he heard from the horn in quite another.

Of course I do not think their language is capable of shading sentences into narrative or giving detail in a complaint, for I have never found anything as yet among them which could justify one in attributing to them so high a type of speech; but in the terms of general grievance, it may have conveyed to Puck the idea of a monkey in deep distress, which he may have wished to avoid. I do think, however, that their present form of speech is developed far above a mere series of grunts and groans, and that some species among them have a much more copious and expressive speech than others do, and some have higher phonic types than others do. I feel almost assured of having traced some slight inflections which modify the values of the phones. I find that some monkeys do not make some of these inflections at all; in others they differ slightly; while in some few cases, long and constant contact seems to have unified their dialects in some degree, very much the same as like causes blend and unify the dialects of human speech. I have found one instance where a capuchin acquired two sounds which strictly belonged to the tongue of the white-face, and another instance in which a young white-face cebus acquired the capuchin sound for food. This latter case occurred within a month, and the monkey continued steadily to improve in its manner of uttering the word. As I regard this as a most remarkable feat, and attended by peculiar conditions, I will relate it in detail.

In the room where the monkeys are kept by a dealer in Washington there is a cage containing a young white-face cebus of rather more than average intelligence. On the same shelf and in an adjacent cage is the little capuchin Puck. They can easily see and hear each other through the open wire partition which separates them, there being no other obstruction. I visited Puck for many weeks almost daily, and always supplied him with food after requiring him to ask me for it in his own language. Having but little interest in the white-face, who was very shy of me, I rarely showed him the slightest attention until I observed him trying to utter the capuchin sound for food, which always secured for Puck a banana or some nuts. Seeing that Puck was always rewarded for uttering this sound, the little white-face began to try it, and as soon as I discovered his purpose I began to reward him in the same way, and I thus saw one step taken

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by a monkey in the mastery of another tongue. At first his effort was quite poor and I could not at once decide what he meant; but practice soon developed in him great proficiency, and now he speaks it almost as plainly as the capuchin himself. This was doubly interesting to me, in view of the fact that I had long believed that no monkey ever acquired the sounds of another species. I frankly admit that this one instance is alone sufficient to cause me to recede from a conclusion rendered untenable by such certain proof, the cogency of which is emphasized by the short time in which it was accomplished; but I still regard it as a rule that monkeys do not do so.

While writing this article I have by me a little capuchin named Nellie. She is gentle, affectionate, and one of the most intelligent of her species that I ever have seen. As the special province of this paper is the speech of her race, I must forego telling some intensely funny things with which she entertains me, except in so far as they are relevant to speech. A frequent and welcome visitor to my study is a bright boy about six years old, for whom Nellie entertains an inordinate fondness, as she does also for my wife. At the sight of the boy Nellie goes into perfect raptures, and when he leaves her she calls for him so earnestly and pathetically that one cannot fail to pity her. On his return she laughs audibly and gives every sign of joy. She never tires of his company, nor gives any part of her attention to others when he is present. I must tell you how I first became acquainted with her. When she arrived at the dealer's, I was invited down to see her. After I introduced myself, she showed no inclination to be formal, and we were soon engaged in a chat about something to eat, the subject above all others that will interest a monkey. On my second visit she was like an old acquaintance, and we had a fine time, and on my third visit she allowed me to put my hands into the cage and handle her at pleasure. On my next visit I took her out of the cage and we had a real romp. This continued for some days, during which time she would answer me when I would use the words for food and drink. She grew quite fond of me and allowed me any liberty. About this time there came to Washington a little girl who was deaf, dumb, and blind; one of her greatest desires was to see a live monkey—that is, to see it with her fingers. She was accompanied by her teacher, who acted as her interpreter, and the dealer sent for me to come and show the girl the monkey, as I could handle her for the child. I took her from the cage, and when any one except myself would put hands on her she

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would growl and show temper; but when I stroked the girl's hair and cheeks first with my own hands and then with the monkey's, she looked up at me inquisitively and uttered a soft, flute-like sound a few times, and then began to pull at the ears and cheeks of the child. In less time than a minute they seemed like old friends and playmates, and for nearly an hour they were a pleasure to each other, and it was with reluctance that they separated. The little simian acted as if she was conscious of the sad affliction of the child, and was at perfect ease with her, though she would decline the tenderest approach of others, and the child appeared not to know that monkeys could bite at all.

The following day, by an accident in which I really had no part except that of being present, Nellie became so frightened at me that my very presence would make her scream. It was mainly on this account that I had her removed to my apartments, where I have supplied her with bells and toys, and fed her on the fat of the land. So we are gradually knitting together again the broken bones of our friendship. I have taken some good records of her voice, and have succeeded in getting two sounds which are common to the species, which I never before succeeded in recording. I have several times elicited from her the negative sign, which I have recently discovered, and will explain below. I am now trying her taste for colors. I find that bright colors and polished metals generally attract her very much.

I have recently devised means for trying the skill of monkeys in numbers, and will soon announce the methods by which I am trying it and the result of my work. I am quite sure of being able to present some very interesting facts. Monkeys know singular from plural, much from little, and many from few; some of them count three, and show that they possess the simple rudiments of reason and method. Though I doubt if they have any ideas in an abstract form, I think that as the concrete must have preceded the abstract idea in the mind of man, there is no reason to ignore it as a step in the development of simian intelligence.

I have just succeeded in eliciting from Nellie the sound of "caution" or monition. I tied a long thread to a glove and placed it in a corner of the room at a distance of several feet from me, but without letting her see it. Holding the end of the string in my hand, I drew the glove obliquely across the room towards her cage. Her quick eye caught the first motion, and she began to warn me. Standing almost

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on tiptoe, her mouth half open, she peeped cautiously, and then in a low whisper said "*egck*," and every few seconds repeated it, at the same time glancing at me to see whether I was aware of the approach of this goblin. Her actions were almost human, while her movements were as stealthy as those of a cat. As the glove came closer and closer, she was more and more demonstrative, and when at last she saw the monster climbing up the leg of my trousers, uttered the sound aloud, and tried to get to the enemy. Having done this a few times with about the same results each time, I relieved her fright and anxiety by letting her examine the glove, which she did with deep interest for a moment, and then turned away. I tried the same thing over and over again, but failed to elicit from her the slightest interest.

As long as the light is kept burning Nellie cannot be induced to retire, and although it is now two o'clock in the morning she is wide awake and playing with her toys. To avoid disturbing her rest, I drew heavy curtains around her cage, lapped them over, and pinned them down in front. I turned down the light and kept quiet to allow her to go to sleep. After a little while, I slowly turned up the light and resumed my writing. In an instant I heard the curtains rustle and saw her little brown eyes peeping out, while she parted the curtains with her little black hands. When she saw what it was causing all this, she chattered to me in her soft, rich tones, until I removed the curtains so that she could look around the room. To see her holding the curtains apart and talking to me suggested a real flirtation. Only those who have experienced these attachments can know how warm and sincere they become. When once you enjoy the confidence of monkeys, nothing can shake it but some act of your own, or one at least that they attribute to you. Their little ears are proof against gossip, and their tongues are free from it.

Among my many friends of the simian race, I must not forget to mention Dolly Varden, a large white-face who was intensely fond of me, and would laugh and play with me by the hour, but never uttered a sound. I do not know whether she was dumb or not, but I sometimes think she was. I never even heard her growl, though I have tried in many ways to induce her to talk. She would laugh in the most human-like way, except that her laughter was silent, and while it is not unusual for monkeys to laugh in that way, it is quite common for them to laugh aloud when very much amused.

I will describe some experiments with the phonograph by which I have been enabled to state with certainty that monkeys laugh aloud. It

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has been said by some that this is not really laughter, but only a kind of good-natured growling. If this is correct, the same is true of human laughter, for I have converted each into the other, and have deceived the very elect of musicians and philologists. I simply take a record of a monkey laughing, while the cylinder is revolving at the highest rate of speed I can attain, and by reducing it to a very low rate I lengthen the sound-waves and lower the pitch to that of human laughter, and find them to be identical in all respects except volume. Then by taking a record of human laughter at a very low rate of speed and increasing it to a very high one, I simply shorten the sound-waves and raise the pitch to that of the monkey, and find that it is identical except in volume. In this manner I have analyzed the voice sounds of man and monkey, and have constructed some devices to imitate the voices of monkeys. By this means I am trying to determine the exact phonic elements contained in the sounds made by different species. To make it plainer, I will detail an experiment tried with the rhesus sound for food. I took a record of the sound on a cylinder revolving at the rate of two hundred revolutions a minute. Then I reduced the speed to fifty per minute, and at this rate reproduced the sound. It will be easily seen that this lengthened the sound-waves fourfold; so that if the original wave was a, the reproduction was equal to $4a$. By thus magnifying the wave, any variation of tension in the vocal cords could be easily detected, and the inflections thus produced could be followed with comparative ease. By this means I brought the sound within easy reach of the human voice, and with my own vocal organs imitated it to a cylinder revolving at fifty and reproduced it at two hundred revolutions per minute, by which I obtained an almost perfect imitation of the sound.

I must here take occasion to say that the difference of pitch, quality, etc., in sounds does not appear to me to depend alone upon the length of the sound-waves or over-tones, but there seems to be a difference of *ultimate form* and *mode of propagation*, which have much to do with the *contour* of the developed sound. These terms express vaguely an idea I have received from analyzing a great number and variety of sounds, which suggest to the mind various geometrical figures. In one case the fundamental sounds suggest an infinite number of eccentric arcs; in another, a sphere, with no fixed size or surface, but composed of countless concentric spirals; in another, an oblique, annulated cylinder, blended in all directions with vacuum. Others break into segments of ever-widening circles. One impression which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has fixed itself deeply in my mind is that all sound-waves, if made visible, would have the form of a convolute spiral. I have recently been aided by Prof. John B. De Motte in reducing these sounds to a visible condition with the phoneidoscope, and found some of them almost exactly as I had imagined them. The test is not crucial, however, and I am now preparing a new series of very novel experiments embracing many sounds of the human voice, of monkeys, birds, machines, and musical instruments, with the hope of ascertaining the real character of the fundamental sounds.

So far I must say that I have found no intrinsic difference between the vocal sounds of man and simian. Their voices differ in compass, pitch, and flexion, but not in their mode of propagation. In fact, I think if human speech were divested of the accretions of social culture and contact, it would not be so unlike the simian speech as popular belief regards it. Notwithstanding the countless centuries of phonetic growth and decay through which the human tongue has passed, there are still fragments of a primitive form of speech which cling to us through all vicissitudes. Many of our sounds are not expressed by the letters of our alphabet, and many of them are not reducible to any literal expression, except by a species of malpractice in which we flex and mar the protophones into a mould differing utterly from the vocal matrix in which they were created. As an example, let us take the sound which we very poorly represent by *umph-humph*, ending with a rising inflection and frequently accompanied by a nod of the head, and we find that this sound and sign are widely used to signify assent; while, on the other hand, the sound *umph-ugh*, ending with a falling inflection and usually accompanied by a shake of the head from side to side, seems to be almost a universal sign of negation or dissent. It is true that the sounds used by different tongues and races of man vary widely, but the signs are almost universal, and are almost, if not quite, the first definite expression used by infants. I have extended my search for these signs far beyond the limits of local inquiry, and up to the present time I have found only few exceptions among all the races of man, and those few exceptions are among Caucasians and chiefly in southern Europe. I have heard that among certain island tribes of Polynesia these signs are reversed, but I have been assured by two officers of the English navy and two of the United States navy who have visited the islands in question that such is not the case. Among the Indians, Mongolians, and Negroes I have found no noteworthy exceptions.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Now, my reason for stating these facts in detail is that I have found the same thing among the simian races. Some months ago I expressed the opinion that no simian dialect contained any negative term, except resentment. Since that time, however, I have found some facts which indicate that I was mistaken in that conclusion. A year ago, in Charleston, when the children who own the little capuchin Jack assured me that he would say *no* by shaking his head, I thought he had been trained to do so, and that the sign did not really signify to him anything at all. Several times the children said to him, "Jack, you must go to bed," at which he would invariably shake his little black head as if he really did not wish to comply. To believe that he understood the words was beyond the limits of my faith, although it was certain that a repetition elicited from him each time the same sign, which indicated that he recognized it as the same sentence, and gave it the same reply each time. I concluded that he had been taught this sign by one sound such as "bed"; but since that time, I find this sign used intuitively among them as a negative sign and generally accompanied by one or the other of two sounds, the one a soft, plaintive, piping sound, and the other a suppressed clucking sound. I have subjected this to many tests, and have met with uniform results. In this I believe I have found the *psycho-physical basis of expression*, and the fact of its being common to man and simian I regard as more than a mere coincidence. Seeking a source from which this sign may have originated, I have concluded that it arises from an effort to turn the head away from something *not* desired, and that it has gradually crystallized into an instinctive expression of negation or refusal; while the nod of approval or affirmation may have grown out of the instinctive lowering of the head as an act of submission or acquiescence, or from reaching the head forward to receive or procure something desired, or conjointly from these two causes.

A striking resemblance to human speech is found in the word which I have expressed by the formula *egck*, which is used by the capuchin as a warning of the approach of some person or thing which it fears or dislikes. I described this word some months ago, but its frequent use among this species emphasizes its importance. As the capuchin uses it, it seems to have a tincture of defiance, something like "beware!" and its equivalent in human speech is very nearly expressed by the sounds "ah-ah!" or "ughn-ughn!" uttered with a strong staccato effect, as is often used by man in warning or forbid-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ding, and especially in addressing young children. Since the discovery of the word for food in the rhesus tongue, I have made a good record of several sounds which I am now studying with the hope of translating them, but I have devoted most of my time to my favorite capuchins and am getting on quite well with them. I often go into the cage in Central Park, New York, and have a great romp with them, but McGinty, my devoted pet, gets so jealous of Micky that he sometimes pouts with me for an hour; and when I am playing with him, if I take Micky into the game, he goes away and will not play with us. Yet they are the best of friends at all other times. McGinty will always divide his food with me, and wants to put it in my mouth, while Micky is so selfish that he will not part with any of his even when he has more than he can eat. He will occasionally give me a piece of stale bread which no animal, however hungry, could eat.

Among the captives of the simian race who spend their lives in iron prisons merely to gratify the cruelty of man, I have many little friends who are devoted to me, as I am to them, and I must confess that I cannot discern in what intrinsic way the love they have for me differs from human love. I cannot see in what respect it is less divine than my own is. I cannot see in what respect the affections of a dog for a kind master essentially differ from those of a child for a parent, nor can I see in what respect the sense of fear for a cruel master differs from that in the child for a cruel parent. It is mere sentiment to ascribe those of the child to any higher source than the same passions in the dog. That dog could have loved or feared another master just as well; and filial love or fear would have reached out its tendrils just as promptly with all the ties of kindred blood removed. I cannot believe that there is any intrinsic difference. It has been said that one is able to assign a definite reason why, and that the other is a vague impulse. I cannot see in what respect the light of a lamp differs from that of a bonfire, except in volume. They are the products of the same forces of nature, acting through the same media, and, becoming causes, produce the same effects. That psychic spark which dimly glows in the animal bursts into a blaze of effulgence in man. The one differs from the other just as a single ray of sunlight differs from the glorious light of noon.

R. L. GARNER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IS IOWA A DOUBTFUL STATE?

THE State of Iowa has been looked upon as the Gibraltar of Republicanism in the North-west. Its adherence to the Republican party has been so unchanging that it rose to the dignity of an axiom. As a matter of fact, however, the State was not so strongly attached to the Republican party as it was popularly supposed to be, and it has gone Democratic. In 1880 the Republican vote was fifty-six per cent of the total vote cast; in 1884, fifty-two per cent; in 1888, fifty-two per cent; while in the election of 1891 it was only a fraction over forty-seven per cent. Many causes have contributed to the Republican losses in Iowa. Combined, they have aided the Democracy to win the State, when separately no one cause, with perhaps a single exception, was strong enough to effect such a result.

Iowa, like Ohio, is eminently a "hiving" State. Settled originally by emigrants from New England, the Middle States, Ohio, and Kentucky, the people have retained and developed the characteristic energy of the early settlers. The State attained in forty years a population of more than 2,000,000, and while making this great advancement, contributed more than any other State of the Union to the growth of Nebraska, the Dakotas, Montana, Oregon, Washington, California, Colorado, and the Territories. Upon all these States the impress of Iowa can be found in their laws, habits, and customs. This emigration accounts at once for a part of the Republican loss in Iowa and the great Republican majorities of the States above mentioned. It may be objected that it is assumed in the foregoing statement that only Republicans have left the State. This assumption is to a great degree true, for probably three-fourths or more of the emigration has been of Republican people. Heretofore about seventy per cent of the Democratic vote has been of foreign birth or of foreign parentage. These people, finding in Iowa the prosperity and homes they had not found in Europe, were content to stay in Iowa, while the restless and impatient Americans pushed farther westward. Citizens of Iowa of foreign birth or of recent foreign descent are content with a business yielding a comfortable living and are satisfied with farms of moderate

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

size. The American boy, however, must have a farm as large as his father's, and therefore when approaching manhood he goes West, where land is cheaper, to take up rarely less than three hundred and twenty to six hundred and forty acres. In Iowa, at least, the Republican party has been composed chiefly of the great middle class, and this middle class in the United States has furnished nearly all the State-makers of the West. The strength of Iowa Republicanism has been and is from the farm, and statistics prove that the farm from the Alleghany Mountains westward has supplied the greater portion of the human tide that has peopled the Mississippi valley, the Western plains, and the Pacific slope. On the other hand, the strength of the Democratic party has been and is in towns and cities; and, once there, it remains fixed. Since the war of the rebellion the Democratic party has not been a State-building party. While Iowa gained nearly three hundred thousand in population from 1880 to 1890, twenty-seven of the counties sustained a loss in population of thirty thousand. These twenty-seven counties in 1880 gave a Republican majority of ten thousand, while in 1891 the same counties gave a Democratic majority of about four thousand. This loss on the one hand and the gain on the other was not produced by changes from one party to the other, but was largely the result of the natural increase of the non-moving Democratic voters and of the emigration of the Republican voters.

The Republican party had control of the national government from 1861 to 1891, with the exception of the four years of President Cleveland's administration. It had control of Iowa from 1856 to 1890. In all these years there were many offices to be filled and many more aspirants than offices. Every national or State appointment that was made satisfied one voter and his immediate friends, and displeased or rendered luke-warm all the other applicants and their friends. This went on for thirty years, and while not nearly all who failed to attain the object of their ambitions left the party, yet a considerable number gradually went over, until, in all these years, the change produced by this cause must be considered as a fairly large factor in the Republican loss. All over the North, wherever the Republicans have been long in power, this singular cause of Republican loss may be easily observed. The Democrats, having no offices to bestow, escaped any similar loss. Probably the amateur, or, it may be, the scholar, in politics will scout the notion of a falling off from such a dishonorable cause; but men who know practical politics will quickly admit the truth of this statement.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

During the war of the rebellion and for some years afterward, all men in favor of the preservation of the Union acted with the Republican party. It comprised the education, the intelligence, and the wealth of the North. Gradually, as time went on and the issues of the war were settled or disappeared, many of those who before the war had acted with the Democratic party went back to their first love. They acted with the Republican party as long as it was necessary to preserve the Union intact, but when that preservation had become an accomplished fact, they had no longer anything in common with the party, and returned to the fold wherein they had been reared. Old free-traders could not and would not advocate a protective policy. Believers in the old Democratic doctrine of silver money refused to continue longer in a party which they accused of demonetizing silver and setting up the single standard of gold. Many who doubted the wisdom of our national-banking policy and believed in the Jacksonian system of State and private banks of issue; all those who opposed the payment of pensions to the survivors of the war (and there are many who, fearing publicly to avow their belief on this question, quietly vote the Democratic ticket, believing that ultimately that party will come out in opposition to pensions); those who believe in the doctrine of State rights and fear, or affect to fear, the tendency of the Republican party toward a strong central government; those who are tainted with the fallacies of greenbackism, or fiat money; those who believe, or affect to believe, that the Republican party is the protector and promoter of trusts, corporations, and monopolies—all these gradually dropped from the party and joined the great Democratic army. The financial panic of 1873 and the distress resulting therefrom drove many men from the Republican to the Democratic ranks. Every year in which a poor crop was gathered added to the number of discontents who always blame the party in power for their personal misfortunes. In short, the Democratic party became a political cave of Adullam, gathering into its shade all who left the Republican party for any reason or caprice. From each and every one of these causes the Republicans suffered a noticeable loss.

In 1891 the railroads doing business in Iowa employed within the State 27,583 men. The compensation of this great army reached the enormous sum of $16,175,410.55 a year, or an average of $587.51 for each man. It will at once be seen what a great voting power may be directed by railroad managers, and how easily these men, using the ballot as they suppose in their own interests, can overthrow one polit-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ical party and raise up another. It must not be understood that the managers of the different railroads attempt to use this power by any form of coercion or threat, for this is not the case. Such an attempt on their part would be instantly resented by the railroad employees, who are a very intelligent body of men and vote their own convictions as freely and independently as any other class of citizens; but at the same time, if they believe that legislation has been or will be enacted adverse to their interests, the party enacting or proposing such legislation is opposed by them at the polls almost to a man. They are quick to discern any movement that tends to decrease their pay; and almost all of them, from trackmen up to managers, are imbued with the idea that "legislation hostile to railways is war upon the great industrial interests connected therewith." It was the fortune of Iowa to begin the agitation for State and governmental control of railroads. Iowa is a State of farms and farmers. At times, under depressed conditions with low prices prevailing for all farm products, men naturally inquired into the reason for low prices. The cereals hardly paid for the growing, and farmers were making no money.

Demagogues took advantage of this state of affairs, and went up and down the land preaching the doctrine that the railroads were responsible for low prices, ignoring utterly the inevitable law of supply and demand, great crops in Europe and in India, and the many other factors that make farming profitable or unprofitable. Under these conditions legislators were chosen and burdensome legislation against the railroads was enacted. In the beginning, doubtless there had been discrimination against the State. Situated as it is at the door of Chicago, farm freights were hauled through the State at a less price than from the State. The State, instead of legislating to equalize these inequalities, went too far and practically put an embargo on the railroads, so that while the roads already built were operated, and operated well, no new roads have been or are being built. Even the construction of "feeders" has been abandoned, and it is thought that Iowa has practically attained her maximum mileage unless a portion of the obnoxious legislation is repealed. Passion, prejudice, and ignorance, instead of reason, experience, and education, made the laws. The agitation was aided by demagogues on the one side and injudicious railroad management on the other. Both sides declared war, and the fight went merrily on. County officers, State officers, members of the legislature and of the railroad commission were elected upon platforms of control and repression of the railroads. One railroad

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

manager foolishly said that he wished "there was no jobbing or manufacturing business on the Mississippi River," and thus brought into the fight against him the merchants and mechanics of the State. The result was that the State seized the roads by the throat and it holds them in that condition to-day.

The Republican party was in power during all this time. The Democratic party was, as usual, quick to see and to grasp the opportunity. It had been in the minority since 1856, and had fallen so low in public esteem that a leading Democrat spoke of the party as a "putrid reminiscence." Grim, conscienceless, desperate, caring nothing for the means it used to attain power, it ran the gamut of all the "issues" in the effort to find one that would give it the majority of the popular vote. It met in convention; the railroads gave passes to most of the delegates; railroad managers and railroad attorneys held the reins; and the astonished State beheld the singular spectacle, year after year, of a platform written by a railroad attorney and reported to the several conventions (usually presided over by railroad adherents) by committees largely composed of railroad men, denouncing railroad corporations as enemies to the prosperity of the farmers. And so it has gone on. Republican railroad men vote the Democratic ticket because they think the Republican policy has, in restricting the roads by legislation, also restricted the earning power of their work; and the Republican farmers vote the Democratic ticket because they believe that the party is in earnest in its platforms denouncing railroad charges as unjust and unreasonable.

No abler rider of two horses going in opposite directions exists than the Iowa Democrats. While no apology can be made for the party's duplicity on this question, neither can an apology be made for the aggressive and unfriendly spirit shown by the last Republican State administration toward the interests of railroad property and railroad men. It is believed now that the tide of opinion upon this question has turned, and that hereafter a fairer and juster spirit will be shown by the legislatures toward all interests of the State. The farm and the railroad have reached a better and clearer understanding of each other's needs, and future legislation will be on parallel lines and not upon divergent ones.

But the one great cause of the decay of Republican majorities in Iowa can doubtless be fairly attributed to the working of the law prohibiting the manufacture and sale of liquors of any kind within the State. In 1882 an amendment to the constitution, prohibiting the sale

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of liquors, was submitted to the voters at a special and non-partisan election. The submission of the question to the people was advocated by the Republicans and opposed by the Democrats. In this instance, at least, the Democrats deviated from their doctrine that the will of the people is the basis of all laws, and refused, as far as they could refuse, to allow the people to vote upon the amendment. The proposed amendment was carried by a majority of nearly 30,000, but upon a technical flaw was afterward declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. The next legislature placed upon the statute-books the present prohibitory law, and since that time it has done its work for weal or for woe. In many counties, probably a majority, where the population of the towns is small, the law has been well enforced, as well, perhaps, as any other law of the State. In the counties in which the cities and large towns are situated, and especially along the Mississippi and Missouri rivers, the law has practically been a dead letter.

Early in its history Iowa scattered broadcast over Europe, semi-officially at least, invitations to settlers to come into the State, and among its advantages were specially named the growing of grapes and the making of wine and beer. For many years previous to the passage of the present prohibitory law the sale of whiskey, brandy, and all other strong liquors had been forbidden. The making of ale, wine, and beer, however, and their sale were not only not prohibited, but were encouraged. Under this condition of affairs, a great influx of settlers came into the State from various parts of Germany. As a rule, these men were Republicans, who joined the army of the Union by thousands, and their courage and devotion to the Union cause were sealed with their blood upon many a field. They expended hundreds of thousands of dollars in breweries and wineries. At one blow the law destroyed the value of this property, and the prohibitionists in command of the Republican party and of the legislature refused to pay for the property thus rendered valueless. This was the first mistake.

Time went on. Slowly but surely the Germans, after hoping against hope, gradually began to leave the party, until now not five per cent of the German vote is cast for Republican candidates; and yet most of these men are still Republicans upon national issues, and many of them yet vote for the Republican presidential candidates. Their sons, however, who have reached the voting age since prohibition became a law, vote the Democratic ticket at both national and State elections. And what is true of the Germans is partially true of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Norwegians and Swedes. Likewise thousands of Republicans of American birth who drifted with the party at first became in time disgusted with the law and either refused to vote at all or voted Democratic ballots. These losses could not be made good by drawing recruits from the ranks of "temperance" Democrats. They were called, but they did not respond; the prohibition Democrats talked prohibition, but regularly voted with the Democrats. They were in favor of the law, but opposed to its enforcement.

Before the effects of the law began to be felt, the extreme prohibitionists in the Republican party had everything their own way, and it was not long before they abandoned the doctrine that belief in prohibition was a test of party loyalty. Made angry by apparent success, they began to apply the party lash; and anti-prohibitionists have not ostensibly but really of late years been put in the background, and "belief in prohibition has been a test of party fealty." The utter failure of the law to stop drinking or to prevent the sale of liquor has also changed the views of many Republicans who favored prohibition or were at least willing to give it a trial; and while these men still vote the party ticket, a persistence by the party in holding its present attitude upon the question will soon cause them to go over to the opposition. What the great majority of the people of the State now demand is county or city option, or home rule. This would allow counties where public sentiment upholds prohibition to have it, and allow other counties where public sentiment is adverse to it to settle the question each in its own way. To this pass have matters come, and unless something is done to satisfy the anti-prohibition Republicans, the State is utterly and irrevocably lost to the Republican party.

Prohibition, whatever it may be in theory, has been, in practice, in the cities of Iowa, an utter and absurd failure, and in most of the larger towns and cities there has been free and unrestrained sale of intoxicants. These towns have had all the evils of the traffic, without the power to throw around it any efficient restrictions. A municipal government is never stronger than the public sentiment that created it, and can enforce no law that public sentiment demands shall not be enforced. This has been tried in the cities in Iowa; and wherever the city governments have enforced the obnoxious law against the will of the people, those governments have been beaten at the polls at the next election. And the citizens of these towns are among the very best citizens of the State. The prohibitionists in Iowa are not a majority of the people; they are not even a majority of the members of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Republican party. They have maintained their ascendency in the party only by reason partly of sentimental appeals for the "home against the saloon," and partly by a fear in the party that the prohibitionists unless humored might place a prohibition ticket in the field. It is time to disregard this threat and to throw away this fear. The Republican party has so far done all that it has been asked to do by its prohibition members. The anti-prohibition portion of the party now demands that its plan be tried, and will enforce its demand no matter what may be the result. To maintain the present attitude is to lose both prohibition and the party. It proposes to lose prohibition and to save the party, which has other duties to perform. Sometimes it is well, it may be, to be politically right and morally wrong, when the standard of what is morally wrong is merely some other man's notion.

The position of the Republicans of Iowa on both railroad agitation and prohibition in the past has been one, it is freely admitted, that it could not avoid. But now the forks of the road have been reached, and if the party expects to remain dominant the irreconcilables and incomprehensibles must be sent to the rear. The two subjects have been dealt with in great measure by appeals to passion and not to reason, and thus narrow men of one idea have assumed to lead the party, and the old and trustworthy leaders upon national lines have been kept in their tents. Small men whose names would never have been suggested under other circumstances have come into prominence by persistent play upon these two strings, and the wiser men of the party have been ignored. With a few exceptions, smaller men have within the past few years filled high offices in Iowa than in any other State in the Union, and the result has been petty quarrels and jealousies without number and gradual but sure decay. On the other hand, of late years the Democratic party in the State has been ably led. The old "bourbons" of the party have been retired and the young men have become leaders. Recruits from the Republican party have been given places of honor. At the last State elections the candidates for governor, lieutenant-governor, and supreme judge on the Democratic ticket were all men who had in recent years been Republicans.

For the foregoing reasons Iowa State politics are of intense interest to the people of the entire country. The internal questions of this State may force it into the Democratic electoral column, when on all national issues a majority of its people are opposed to the beliefs and tendencies of the Democratic party.

JOHN N. IRWIN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE BURIAL MONOPOLY OF PARIS.

In every great city the poor live by the worldly vanities of the rich. In Paris they die in the same way. It is the manufacture of innumerable superfluities which makes up the bulk of the industry of the working classes. The French capital has developed an ingenious system by which the poor are furnished with a free burial at the expense of the "pride, pomp, and circumstance" which Dives considers his due on the road to the tomb. One of the largest, best managed, and most profitable industries in Paris is that of the *Pompes Funèbres*, the gigantic monopoly which alone has the privilege of transporting the dead through the streets of Paris in funeral style. It possesses undertakers' material to the value of over four millions of francs, does some six millions a year of business, and turns over nearly two and a half millions of this as clear profit to its accredited owners, the church establishment of the city, after gratuitously and decently burying some three out of every five of the dead as indigent subjects.

Each country and each age has its own fashion of disposing of its dead, from the Patagonian who makes "lion meat" of his spouse back to the ancient Roman with his ancestral urns. Taken all in all, perhaps there is no more reasonable arrangement than that of the thrifty Parisian who manages to have each disposal of the dead carried out "decently and in order" through the exploitation of a love of lavish display in a minor portion of the community. One sees nothing of the ghastly side of the undertakers' work in visiting the vast premises which have been recently devoted to the use of the *Pompes Funèbres*, away out in the extreme northeast of Paris, in La Villette. There we found only "the trappings and the suits of woe," the materials for the funeral decorations and the funeral *cortéges*. Take it altogether, a ramble over the establishment is one of the most interesting sights of the city.

The *Pompes Funèbres* occupy two large areas, one of about twelve and three-quarters acres and the other about eleven and three-quarters acres, each having fronts on the Rue Curial and the Rue d'Aubervilliers. There is also a branch *dépôt* for the south side of the Seine, in the Avenue de Maine, of about two and one-half acres, but this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is used only for the cheaper class of funerals, all the material for the great display being not only stored but manufactured at La Villette. Between eleven and twelve hundred people are engaged in this remarkable enterprise. As one enters the chief *dépôt*, under a large archway from the Rue d'Aubervilliers, passing the director's office and the various bureaux and clerks' rooms on either hand, there appears a great courtyard which at eleven o'clock each morning is like a miniature queen's drawing-room in black, for at that hour sally forth in all directions over Paris the vehicles for those melancholy processions to which every well-regulated Parisian lifts his hat as they pass him in the street. This courtyard is principally occupied at other hours by a party of indefatigable carpet-beaters who ply their clubs on the countless thousands of yards of heavy drapery which has been returned from the house and church decorations, and is then stored, each piece on its proper shelf.

Entering the long wing to the left, we first come to a store-house for ladders, hundreds in numbers, to fit anything from the tiniest room to the great *façade* of Notre Dame itself, and all, of course, painted black. Beyond these are two large two-storied amphitheatres with their walls filled with the rolls of house and church hangings in all sizes and each labelled. These are made in black broadcloth, but heavily edged and cornered like a main-sail, with reefs of strong canvas, to stand the heavy strain of use and weather, when the weight must often be immensely increased by the rain or snow. Each church in Paris has its alcove, and every other contingency is specially provided for, including even country orders. There is also a complete assortment of snow-white hangings, the *Pompes Funèbres* being obliged to supply these to any one who desires them. As a fact, however, these are only used for the funerals of youth, such being the French custom. Mounting to the second floor, we find many rooms filled with the accessories, such as chair coverings, silver cords, flags for military funerals as well as frames for canopies, temporary altars, and wreath hangings; then a store-room for materials, and in one great hall thirty women busy with sewing machines, manufacturing the hangings, etc. In one of the rooms there is also a vast collection of the black shields which are hung on the hearses and churches with a silver initial letter of the name of the deceased. These letters are changed by a slide, and the shields vary in size, the tallest being three or four feet in height.

Crossing the courtyard again to the other wing, we find another class

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of paraphernalia. Here are sets of frames, hooks, rods, etc., to fit each church in Paris, and a variety of other structures to which the hangings, great and little, are attached. Next, a large stock of benches, enough as a showman's stock to have excited the envy of the late Mr. Barnum, may be seen, it being often required at grand funerals to provide temporary seating accommodations for thousands of people. The most striking feature of this wing, however, is the vast collection of candelabra and enormous silvered candlesticks, such as reminds one of the fabulous store which the hero of the Legend of Montrose got into such trouble about. The *Pompes Funèbres* could have served the turn of Angus Macaulay without resort to his grim jest. Nowhere out of fairyland, not even in the theatre of the most abundant resources, can such a dazzling display be found; for although only metal or wooden shells, the pieces are plated as if all the mines of Peru had been depleted, and they are constantly being re-plated. When first brought back from the process, they are used in the high-class funerals, and descend in glory as the brightness wears off. Here, too, are thousands of sockets in all lengths for those dummy candles so much displayed in Catholic ceremonials. In the upper floor of this wing painters and gilders are at work, and here are stored the "boasts of heraldry" in the shape of armorial shields used at various interments of the real and would-be nobility. Even royalty is represented; in fact, a live king, or rather a dead one, the British royal arms of 1801–1837 shining on the centre of the wall. For George the Fifth ended his sightless career here, and came to ask Christian burial of the city which, like himself, had been the victim of Bismarckian vengeance and rapine. Descending into the lower stories, one finds the coffin office, where are kept metal labels to be attached to every casket, of high or low, the year and the *arrondissement* being inscribed thus: "1892–IV." This means that the deceased died in 1892, and in the Hotel de Ville *arrondissement*. Here are great sacks of sawdust saturated with carbolic acid, the compound which the *Pompes Funèbres* use for putting into coffins as a bed, and also for disinfection for transport.[1] In several rooms on the ground-floor are workmen engaged in

[1] The efficacy of this method in case of railway transportation is strenuously contested in the "*Revue d'Hygiène*" (1885) by Dr. H. Schoenfeld, who also puts forward a concoction of his own. The subject has been a troublesome one for years with the *Pompes Funèbres* of Paris, the largest mortuary exploiters in the world. Of course the travelling public by sea and by land are deeply interested in the matter. Dr. Schoenfeld says that the strongest metal coffin is of no avail against the expansive power of a badly prepared and decomposing body.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the construction of zinc and lead coffins, or rather in most instances wooden coffins covered with these two metals. Here, too, is the blacksmith's shop, where all the ironwork is constructed.

Crossing the courtyard again to the left wing, one can have a peep at the stock of head-gear and horse-plumes which make such an important feature of street show, where there are enough ostrich feathers to adorn the heads of every woman in Paris. But now we find the great stable fronting the yard from the rear all astir. The mourning procession is moving, and hearse after hearse, carriage after carriage, from the gorgeous silver *lambrequins* of the costly classes to the severely simple black braid of the cheap orders, file one after another, a ghostly phalanx, no passengers being aboard but the stiff and starched master of the ceremonies, who occupies a seat in the last coach of each file.

Next, one can dive down into the depths below all the buildings and the great yard itself, for it is all undermined by a vast cellar, in which over ten thousand coffins of all styles and sizes are always kept on hand, as the law requires. Oak and deal are the only woods, but they are each made in various methods, thick and thin, special cases for ocean shipments, railway travelling, etc., and in peculiar square-ended fashion for Jewish interments. The indigent cases, which are the majority, are a light dome-shaped affair of simple scantling. The enormous size of some of the stock would indicate that we occasionally have giants in our days. This vast sepulchre of houses for human clay yet to be tenanted has a most weird effect on the stranger, and seekers after a new sensation, like M. Jules Verne or Mme. Sarah Bernhardt, might draw inspiration from a visit here.

Coming up to the light, we plunge into an arena where all is life, but brute life. This is the unrivalled stable of the *Pompes Funèbres*, where over three hundred and fifty beautiful black horses are stabled. The Black Horse Cavalry and other famous squadrons of sable hue never were mounted on such perfect symmetries of horseflesh as are here gathered. These are more than enough for all ordinary occasions, but the *Pompes Funèbres* have the remarkable legal right to requisition as many other horses (which must be black) as are needed from the *Compagnie des Petites Voitures*, which consequently receives twenty-five francs for each span and coachman for the day. The largest number thus obtained in one day was eighty pair. The *Pompes Funèbres* also possess a few white horses for the white-draped *cortéges* before mentioned. The harness-rooms are as exquisite as are the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stables. Many thousands of francs' worth of spare harness are stored here, for the finest special provision is needed to carry the great trappings of the costly shows with ease and decorum. Over many of these sets of harness the names of the horses, such as "Ferron," "Fichet," "Merlet," "Prise," "Holz," etc., are fully inscribed, for each of the aristocratic steeds of the *Pompes Funèbres* has many sets of full harness to suit its business, carrying peer or pauper, going on a country jaunt, or taking a turn in town. There is also a large stock of light harness with which to attire the hired horses of the *Petites Voitures*, the latter being used only for the minor displays. Carriages for all these functions are specially provided, including twenty-four special road cars with closed cab in front, just behind the driver, for the mourners, and a long boot behind for the casket. There are more ghastly carriages still in the shape of the vehicles for bringing the mangled specimens from the dissecting-rooms. The road cars are also frequently used for transport in Paris itself previous to burial, and often one is seen in the dusk of the evening waiting at that famous gate of death on the *Quai de l'Archevêché*, having come to take a corpse which has been recognized during the day by some sobbing relative who sits in the coupé ready to make an official claim for the remains. The sight usually draws a crowd of the sort which during the day streams through the damp corridor of the Morgue, and being now shut out finds some consolation for its morbid appetite in at least seeing the canopy of death, if not death itself.

Passing the fine blacksmith's establishment, we find ourselves in the Rue Curial, and, by ascending a deep stairway in the wall, discover a great hall with numerous drivers and other employees in waiting, lunching and gossiping. These are the men who are on duty, ready to start to any part of Paris, like soldiers in a guard-room. Descending into the street and passing along a few hundred yards, we enter the annex[1] to the *Pompes Funèbres*, entirely devoted to coach and coffin

[1] This domain is nearly equal in area to the original plot of ground, and has been recently purchased by the Paris ecclesiastics rather in defiance of the stipulations made in the first years of the Third Republic. Just before the fall of the Empire, a movement was set on foot to do away with the private contractor, the middleman who had stood between the public and the church monopolists since the inauguration of the *Pompes Funèbres*, in 1806. It was then mooted that the ecclesiastics, who already owned the material, should also own the place of business. But after the fall of the Empire, the city of Paris insisted on the ownership of the land and buildings, for which the churches paid the rent. The contract was abolished and the whole profits taken by the clericals. Since then the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

manufacture. The yard which adjoins the Rue Curial is a most touching collection of ancient memories, scores of discarded hearses being here stored, showing all the developments of the hearse since the century began. The experiences of Dickens' bagman's uncle at Edinburgh are nothing to this. South Kensington's collection of venerable steam-engines never could run such a ghastly race of death as the phalanx of phantom hearses in the *Pompes Funèbres*. The large yard toward the Rue d'Aubervilliers is anything but a dismal show-house. Here all is life and bustle: a great timber-yard on the one side and a great saw-mill on the other keep a large staff of artisans busy; carpenters, coach-builders, painters, wheelwrights, are all about and alive, and in their outward appearance quite "as merry as the day is long." Yet one sees two young pet ravens black as night holding possession of a pretty greensward in the centre of the yard, their hoarse voices seeming to croak the fatal entrance to the *Pompes Funèbres*.

The figures given in the table on the next page supply valuable material for analyzing the population of Paris over the past thirty years, though the records of the *Pompes Funèbres* reach far back of 1860. The burial monopoly, like most things in modern Paris, is a result of the revolution. In the days of the ancient *régime* the dead were carried on the shoulders of drunken porters whose hideous orgies are a favorite theme of satirists of the manners of the day. The republican government forbade any but the bodies of children under seven years to be taken on the shoulders, and finally in the year XII. (1803–1804) devised the present monopoly, by which the poor should be buried at the expense of the display of the rich. Many an instructive hint of the history of Paris and of France can be gathered from these statistics. Of course, the figures of 1870–71 will at once attract attention. But it is not war alone for which the figures of the *Pompes Funèbres* give data. The experiences of peace are carefully noted. Thus, the very last day of this period, the 31st of December, 1889, was the most fatal day in the statistics of Paris mortality, being the climax of the influenza

monopoly has been threatened with extinction, as I shall note later on, and the monopolists, taking time by the forelock, have prepared a place to which they may fly if evicted by the city. As they possess a stock of material which it would take years to duplicate, and the good-will of nine-tenths of the people who want profitable funeral displays, they claim that, monopoly or no monopoly, they could defy and laugh at the city, especially if the latter should choose voluntarily to saddle itself with the expense of the enormous number of pauper funerals.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

epidemic, which most readers will be surprised to learn was far more fatal than the cholera scourges of 1865, of 1866, or of 1884. The terrible mortality among the little ones of Paris is the greatest blot on the town. They seem born but to die.

The services rendered by the gigantic industry can best be appreciated by a study of the following table of the burials performed by the *Pompes Funèbres* for the thirty years from 1860 to 1889:

	Gratuitous Funerals.				Paying Funerals.			
Year.	Adults.	Children.	Total.	Proportion. Per Cent.	Adults.	Children.	Total.	Grand Total.
1860....	10,938	13,993	24,931	63.43	11,904	2,467	14,371	39,302
1861....	11,940	14,405	26,345	63.15	12,705	2,662	15,367	41,712
1862....	11,444	14,316	25,760	62.52	12,839	2,598	15,437	41,197
1863 ...	11,625	13,962	25,587	61.06	13,724	2,605	16,329	41,916
1864....	12,064	14,674	26,738	59.58	14,873	2,736	17,609	44,347
1865....	14,292	15,971	30,263	60.05	17,044	3,087	20,131	50,394
1866....	13,310	15,112	28,422	58.46	17,269	2,925	20,194	48,616
1867....	11,742	13,971	25,713	58.16	15,791	2,706	18,497	44,210
1868....	12,285	15,030	27,315	58.53	16,396	2,956	19,352	46,667
1869....	12,361	14,438	26,799	56.86	17,311	3,015	20,326	47,125
1870 ...	21,066	21,475	42,541	60.44	24,327	3,507	27,834	70,375
1871....	28,087	21,710	49,797	66.57	21,996	3,002	24,998	74,795
1872....	10,583	13,514	24,109	57.99	14,751	2,711	17,462	41,559
1873....	11,338	13,679	25,017	57.40	15,833	2,728	18,561	43,578
1874 ...	11,033	13,183	24,216	56.66	15,808	2,708	18,516	42,732
1875....	11,927	14,559	26,486	55.77	17,881	3,121	21,002	47,488
1876....	12,917	14,894	27,811	55.28	19,083	3,407	22,490	50,301
1877....	11,988	15,298	27,286	55.64	18,160	3,588	21,748	49,034
1878....	12,102	14,952	27,054	54.18	19,192	3,691	22,883	49,937
1879....	13,184	15,503	28,767	54.06	20,675	3,776	24,451	53,218
1880....	14,058	16,767	30,825	53.26	23,505	4,541	27,046	57,871
1881....	13,631	16,728	30,359	52.43	22,921	4,623	27,544	57,903
1882....	13,957	16,532	30,489	50.99	24,525	4,772	29,297	59,786
1883....	13,573	16,408	29,981	51.90	23,364	4,415	27,779	57,760
1884....	15,725	16,556	32,281	55.84	21,190	4,336	25,526	57,807
1885....	15,645	15,087	30,732	55.28	21,006	3,854	24,860	55,592
1886....	16,398	16,037	32,435	56.12	21,347	4,004	25,351	57,786
1887....	16,403	15,093	31,496	56.51	20,525	3,707	24,232	55,728
1888....	16,197	14,722	30,919	56.73	20,192	3,387	23,579	54,498
1889...	17,157	15,094	32,251	56.79	21,094	3,434	24,528	56,779
	418,970	463,743	882,713		556,231	101,069	657,300	1,540,013

Of the nine classes into which the paying funerals are divided, it is noted that of the six hundred and fifty-seven thousand three hundred for the thirty years, five hundred and seventy-four were first class, four thousand five hundred and twenty-five second class, fourteen thousand eight hundred and thirty-four third class, twenty-eight thousand one hundred and twenty-seven fourth class, sixty-seven thousand nine hundred and forty-two fifth class, one hundred and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

forty-three thousand and twelve sixth class, three hundred and twenty-six thousand and seventy-seven seventh class, sixty-nine thousand and sixty-seven eighth class, and three thousand one hundred and forty-two ninth class. During the last year, 1889, the numbers were: First class twenty-four, second class one hundred and seventy-seven, third class six hundred and sixty, fourth class one thousand two hundred and four, fifth class two thousand seven hundred and twenty-nine, sixth class five thousand four hundred and nineteen, seventh class eleven thousand and eighty-seven, eighth class three thousand and sixty-three, ninth class two hundred and fifteen; total, twenty-four thousand five hundred and seventy-eight.[1]

For the six hundred and fifty-seven thousand three hundred funerals for the thirty years, the sum of fifty-nine million seven hundred and fifty-nine thousand one hundred and thirty-five francs and sixty-seven centimes was paid over to the church establishment as profit, two million two hundred and thirty-five thousand two hundred and forty-four francs and seventy-four centimes being paid in 1889. This immense revenue has naturally whetted the appetite of all connected with the business of burials, and fierce indeed have been the struggles to get a finger in the rich monopoly since its inauguration, in 1806. There have been comparatively few changes in the directorship, however, the original undertaker, M. Bobee, being succeeded by M. Labath in 1812, M. Hervail and M. Shickler in 1822, M. Fabas in 1832, M. Anatole Pector in 1842, and M. Leon Vofflard in 1852. The two last named waged a bitter pamphlet war for ten or fifteen years over the monopoly, while not a shred of dusty trappings of the *Pompes Funèbres* was left unwashed in public. M. Vofflard was a private undertaker and was continually bringing the public officials to book and informing the public how much cheaper he could perform funerals, and just what was not included in the monopoly. M. Pector managed to weather the 1848 revolution, but called himself a ruined man when he lost the contract under the Empire; yet he is said to have died worth a million francs. M. Vofflard, the doughty champion against monopoly, proved the longest monopolist of all, for he survived even the commune of 1871 and lasted until the business was taken out of a lessee's hands

[1] The fondness of the Parisian for the seventh-class funeral is very marked. "The respectable second class" is a famous expression in England to indicate a large portion of those who travel there by rail. Evidently in France these constitute the "respectable seventh class" when among the dead.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

altogether in 1878, and the church establishments undertook to manage their fine monopoly themselves by the agency of a director, who is now M. Chauveau.

The monopoly of the *Pompes Funèbres* in the hands of church establishments will doubtless seem a strange anomaly to many when they recollect the rampant secularism of the republican government, its anti-clerical crusade, and, above all, the distinct hostility of the Paris municipal council to priestly interference. It is excellent evidence in favor of the sagacious and beneficial management of the institution of the Parisian clerics that no crusade has yet succeeded against them or indeed made much progress in popular favor; still, the institution has been assailed of recent years, and in a fashion which indicates serious modifications in the future. The church holding a monopoly to bury free-thinkers and secularists, and obliged, not as of old, to cast in contumely their remains on unconsecrated earth, but to bear them with all the pomp and circumstance desired by the relatives, is after all a most curious arrangement, to say the least. Neither of the ill-yoked parties seems liable to be at ease. This idea has forcibly struck recent reformers, and the following quotation with regard to an effort made to upset the *Pompes Funèbres* a year or two ago is most interesting. The author refers to the bill which passed the Chamber of Deputies, but ultimately failed in the Senate, and also offers some comments upon it, which are probably the reasons which led to an adjournment of the reform:

"The legislature of 1812, considering that funeral manifestations most frequently consist in the solemnity of religious ceremony, in ornamentation, in decoration of the temples of worship, and even in the apparatus of transport, wishing, also, in the interest of those who conducted the funerals, not to divide the monopoly into two parts, one relating to the religious display or to the religious edifice, the other to the ceremonies of transport or conveyance—in fact, desiring to give to the ecclesiastical establishments a valuable source of revenue, and also to assure a public service—accorded to the church and to the consistories the exclusive right of furnishing the carriages, hangings, ornaments, and generally to supply all furniture necessary for burials and for decency and proper observance of funerals. This union of the two services, one religious and the other not, in the hands of the ecclesiastical establishments has brought about scandals contrary to the intention of the law in these later years. It has been found that for civil funerals the churches have been unwilling or unable to furnish ornaments, especially poles without religious emblems. Painful incidents have therefore arisen. The liberty of conscience of citizens has seemed to be threatened by this state of things. The legislature was appealed to, and on the 12th of November, 1883, the Chamber of Deputies adopted a bill, the spirit of which must be approved and the scope of which seems excellent. We notice

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that the law will take away from the churches a portion of their resources without giving an equivalent. It would have been foolish, in making the *Pompes Funèbres* a commercial service, to compel communes to pay into the hands of the churches all or part of the profits which they might derive from the monopoly which was given them. The following is the text of the projected law as voted by the Chamber of Deputies:

"'ARTICLE 1. The exclusive rights of the churches and consistories to furnish all necessaries for burials and funeral display shall cease after the passing of this law.

"'ARTICLE 2. Three months after the promulgation of a resolution of the municipal council, approved by the prefect, such resolution shall settle the most convenient manner for transporting bodies. The commune shall be required to procure within the same period, by hire or purchase, the necessary materials for transport and burials. It alone shall have the right of supply. The right shall be exercised by itself through a contractor or agent. The churches, consistories, and religious establishments cannot become agents.

"'ARTICLE 3. The materials furnished by the commune shall consist of at least one bier and black and white mortuary cloths. They shall be the same for all parties and shall have no religious emblems.

"'ARTICLE 4. Subject to the approval of the prefect, no other supplementary tax can be levied to the profit of the commune, or its undertaker or contractor, for presenting or laying bodies in religious edifices.

"'ARTICLE 5. The burial of the indigent shall be decent and gratuitous. In these cases the coffins shall be given gratuitously by the commune.

"'ARTICLE 6. Articles 18, 19, 21, 22 to 26 of the decree of the 2d Prairial, year XII., and clause III. of the decree of 18th of May, 1806, are cancelled. The decree of the 18th of March, 1811, and subsequent decrees touching the organization of the *Pompes Funèbres* in Paris are likewise cancelled. It shall be settled by decree of the Council of State within a period of three months as to the new organization of the *Pompes Funèbres* in Paris.

"'ARTICLE 7. The contracts actually existing between the churches and consistories and the contractor or administrator shall remain in force until their expiration.'

"The distinction is excellent. The churches and consistories retain the monopoly of furnishing for the interior and exterior ornamentation of the churches, and furnishing objects for the celebration of religious ceremonies. The communes will have the service of transporting the corpse, furnishing the mortuary hangings of the mortuary chamber where the custom of the locality admits. One cannot but applaud these dispositions as most favorable to liberty, and as giving the communes and the ecclesiastical bodies their proper functions, with the great advantage of decency of burials and respect for all opinions."[1]

The names of many undertakers appear in the Paris directory who advertise to take charge of funerals in the suburbs and transports

[1] Chareyre (Auguste): "*Traité de la Législation aux Cadavres*," Paris, 1884. This deadlock staved off all further attempts until the present year, when some of the radical members of the municipal council of Paris again brought the subject before the legislature, but their bill still leaves the church-revenue question and the gratuitous-funeral question unsolved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

abroad. They pretend to have all material in hand for such enterprise. As a fact, they have no stock at all. They undertake for a five-per-cent commission to relieve the bereaved family of all dealings with the Mayor and the *Pompes Funèbres*, printing notices of death, invitations to the funeral, etc., and are debarred from doing more in cases of burial in Paris. Where it is a case of burial elsewhere, the immense stock acquired in recent years by the *Pompes Funèbres* renders vain all competition with the great monopoly, the latter being able to decorate any church or the smallest room at a moment's notice with material all fitted to a nicety. The private undertakers hire their goods of the *Pompes Funèbres* even for distant contracts such as the burial of distinguished strangers abroad who chance to die in Paris. The *Pompes Funèbres* practically enjoy even a coffin monopoly, since, although not expressly stated in the famous act of 23d *Prairial*, year XII., as the Mayors are there given power to regulate the transport, all coffins are to be approved by the Mayor, and thus only those of the *Pompes Funèbres* are allowed. The *Pompes Funèbres* of another city can also be engaged if desired, but this latter cannot transport a body inside of Paris, nor can the Parisian *Pompes Funèbres* transport a body inside the limits of a commune where a *Pompes Funèbres* is established.

A minor enterprise of recent years is a slight infringement of their monopoly, and countenanced for their own convenience by the Paris administration, to wit, the use of "funeral omnibuses" where a larger number of mourners wish to follow the hearse than are provided for in the class. These omnibuses are owned by a company founded for the purpose with the permission of the *Pompes Funèbres*. These vehicles are a great convenience, for the procession must often travel considerable distances; and though much following on foot is common, women and children cannot stand the long walk into the suburbs. No burials in central Paris are allowed, except in such remarkable exceptions as that of Victor Hugo at the Panthéon. Old Paris, for over a thousand years one of the chief towns of the world, always walled in and always crowded, had become a vast charnel-house; and previous to the revolution, in the time of Louis XV., all burials in the town were forbidden except in certain rare cases. The suburban cemeteries were in the great circle which Louis Napoleon swept into his enlarged Paris of 1860. In that circle also are found the three famous North, East, and South cemeteries, established in 1801, the popular names of which are Montmartre, Père la Chaise, and Mont-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

parnasse; also the much-contested Picpus cemetery, where the great royalist families, as a grim satire on the revolution, chose to make their shrine, to mix their dust with the headless trunks of their ancestors, huddled here fresh from the guillotine. Picpus cemetery (where, by the way, Lafayette is buried), after being several times closed as an "insult to the revolution," or for "keeping alive its memories," was finally discontinued ten years since. The three great cemeteries are, of course, still used, but they will be in all probability discontinued before many years. They are at the present time supplements of six cemeteries beyond the new walls (Ivry, St. Ouen, Pautin, La Chapelle, Batignolles, and Bagneux), in which also gratuitous and temporary concession burials since 1873 have had to take place. As these are the vast majority of all burials, the cemeteries in the town are partially obsolete already. Nine other cemeteries, belonging to the communes swept into Paris in 1860, are still used for lot-owners of their localities to a very minor degree. During the siege, these and other disused places were temporarily opened for the victims of the war. Necessity knows no law, not even sanitation.

Since 1889 the notorious *fosse commune* for the vast number of burials is much modified. The rising tide of democratic control of public affairs has made an insistance that each coffin, even of a pauper, shall be separated by earth from its neighbors, and that the spot shall be capable of identification for the disposal of mementos so lavishly affected by the Parisian populace. The temporary concessions of burial lots for five years for fifty francs are a curious feature of the burial arrangements. They work well, however. The mournful reflections from Hamlet to Rip Van Winkle on the brief nature of post-mortem memories are only too well founded, and few are the graves which after five years are not neglected. Still, a longer interval has been invented recently (1886), by which for 300 francs one gets a thirty years' lease of "six feet of French earth." As only 200 francs more are required for a perpetual title, this kind of lease would seem to be little desirable; yet it finds much favor.

The French are economical to the last fraction, and they always purchase only so much as they require. The thirty years' use of the grave is just what will suffice for many for whom five is not enough. For it must be understood that the graves are for the use of the living and not of the dead. No people in the world derive so much pleasure from their dead as the Parisians. The Feejeans or the crew of the "Nancy Brig" are examples of crude and wasteful notions of mortuary

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

economy. To eat one's companion is only a temporary pleasure. After the morsel is digested, the memory is no comfort. But the environs of Paris on a pleasant Sunday in summer seem one vast holiday for the pilgrims of the cemeteries. The *Pompes Funèbres* monopoly precludes private enterprise in one direction, but it bursts forth in another. The roads simply swarm with bazars of mortuary tributes at the sign of the "Angel Gabriel," the "Infant Jesus," etc.; and the flowers, the wreaths, the crosses, are scattered over the ground by anything but a sad-faced multitude. In fact, it was argued as a final veto against the removal of burials from Paris (after the manner of Woking for London) that Parisians would never be deprived of their gala days, the *jours des morts*, when "all Paris" seeks the suburban cemeteries. The cemetery is at once the pleasure ground and the political arena. The French exemplify their perpetual gayety in nothing so much as in this regard.

Besides the expenses for the funeral, all but the indigent pay a tax to the municipality. In France everything is taxed, even a dead body. You cannot die decently unless you get a stamped and signed permit. This tax entitles you to the service of the public official who is the most important personage in a French funeral procession, to wit, the *ordinateur*, whose cocked hat, staff of office, and sash are well known to strollers in Paris streets. This gentleman is truly "monarch of all he surveys." In the most crowded thoroughfares, in the greatest whirl of Parisian life, all must stand aside for him and his to pass. A lift of his wand and all must wait. The history of this interesting individual is worth studying:

"This creation comes to us from the revolution, at first intrusted to a member of the *Comité Civil* in each *arrondissement*. The functions were delegated by the *Maires* to subaltern officials. This tacit delegation, which shows the negligence of the citizens of the *Comité Civil*, was later legalized by a regulation of the public administration, which established an inspector of burials in each *arrondissement*. The *employé* thus named, clothed in a Carmagnole and a red phrygian cap, escorted the coffin covered with a tricolor flag. A metal badge on the breast, he advances to the edge of the grave, and with a self-satisfied accent and the gravity of a functionary in the discharge of his duty, hurls the following sacramental formula to the grave-digger: 'In the name of the law, I command you to cover this corpse with earth.' In the year IV. (1795), the *ordinateur* made way for the inspector. For each burial he bore the following order: 'Order for burial. Canon of Paris. The citizen or *ordinateur* of the council of the said *arrondissement* will cause to be buried the body of ——, aged ——, died at —— o'clock, No. — —— Street.'"[1]

[1] Gambert (B.): "*Traité de Législation des Pompes Funèbres*," vol. ii., p. 5 (Marseilles, 1876).

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Never but once in Paris has the function of the *ordinateur* of a funeral *cortége* been seriously interfered with. The experiment is not likely to be repeated. It cost the Bourbons the throne of a thousand years. Nothing served so effectually to give the *coup de grâce* to Charles the Tenth or to prove that that pig-headed individual and all his embalmed mummies of the old *régime* were as impossible in modern France as the scandalous incidents at the burial of the Duke de la Rochefoucauld in 1827, when the coffin of the most honored scion of the most honored family France has ever possessed was hustled into the mud and broken open in the Rue St. Honoré by ruffianly policemen, to the horror of all Paris and the whole world. It was really too much. It was not a wicked revolutionist or Bonapartist partisan, but a royalist of the grandest caste, the bearer of the most illustrious name in old as in new France, great in letters, science, and statesmanship. That broken coffin in the Rue St. Honoré cost the ministry their places and the king his country. They tried to bow before the storm, to hush up the affair, but the public feeling was too deep and unforgiving. The French are creatures of extremes. Frivolous in life, they have a morbid respect for all connected with death. They, even more than the world at large, will pay honors to the soulless clay they derided or left to misery in life. It is this sentiment which has so long been exploited with such profit by the *Pompes Funèbres* and which this institution, even if modified, is long likely to exploit.

EDMUND R. SPEARMAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WRITERS AND SUBJECTS IN THE APRIL FORUM.

EDWARD AUGUSTUS FREEMAN (*A Review of My Opinions*) was born in Staffordshire in 1823. He was educated at Oxford, where he gained a fellowship, and first became known as a student of mediæval architecture. He soon afterward attained eminence as a historian. Among his works are a "History of Architecture," a "History of Federal Government," a "History of the Norman Conquest," "History and Conquests of the Saracens," three volumes of "Historical Essays," and "Some Impressions of the United States" written after a visit to this country in 1883, during which he lectured in the chief cities. He died in Spain on March 16, 1892. At the time of his death he was at work on a history of Sicily.

WILLIAM L. WILSON (*A Campaign for a Principle*) was born in Virginia in 1843. He was educated at Columbian College, District of Columbia, and at the University of Virginia. After serving in the Confederate Army, he held for several years a professorship in Columbian College, which he resigned in order to practise law. In 1882 he became president of the University of Virginia, and resigned the next year to enter Congress, to which he had been elected as a Democrat. He has been several times re-elected. He is a man of scholarly attainments, an authority on political and economic subjects, and has a high reputation as a legislator.

FREDERIC R. COUDERT (*The Democratic Revolt in New York*) was born in New York City in 1832. On his graduation from Columbia College he studied law, and in 1853 he began in New York the practice of his profession, in which he has won distinction. In 1877 and 1882 he was made a delegate to represent the interests of American commerce at the International Congress on the Laws of Nations. He has several times declined a nomination to the Supreme Court and in 1888 refused an appointment to the Court of Appeals. He has long been active in the Democratic party of New York. He is a fluent speaker, and has delivered many addresses and lectures.

MATTHEW HALE (*How the New York Senate Was Captured*) was born in Chelsea, Vt., was graduated at the University of Vermont in 1851 and admitted to the bar of the State of New York in 1853. He has practised law in Albany for twenty years, has been a member of the New York Senate, and was a delegate to the New York Constitutional Convention of 1867-68. He was formerly a Republican, but for several years has been independent in politics. He was President of the New York State Bar Association in 1890.

JOSEPH S. HARRIS (*Our Anthracite Supply and its Distribution*) was born in Pennsylvania in 1836. He was trained for the profession of a railroad engineer, and spent ten years in the service of the United States Government, on the Coast Survey. He was in command of the surveying vessel attached to Farragut's fleet which opened the Mississippi River. Since 1864 he has had charge at different times, as engineer, superintendent, receiver, or president, of the interests of several of the largest producers and transporters of anthracite in his native State.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

F. HEINRICH GEFFCKEN (*The Germans as Emigrants and Colonists*) was born in Hamburg, Germany, in 1830. He is professor *emeritus* of international law in the University of Strasburg. He became widely known several years ago through his imprisonment and trial upon a charge of high treason by Prince Bismarck for publishing the diary of the late Emperor Frederick. Professor Geffcken is one of the foremost European political writers.

POULTNEY BIGELOW (*The Free-Trade Tendency of William II.*) was born in New York City in 1855. He is the son of Hon. John Bigelow, late United States Minister to France. He received his early education in France and Germany. After his graduation at Yale College, in 1879, he travelled in Japan and China. On his graduation from the Columbia Law School he practised law for a year, and then devoted himself to literature. He is the author of "The German Emperor and His Eastern Neighbors" and is a contributor to the Berlin "Nation" and the English and American magazines.

PHILIP GILBERT HAMERTON (*The Learning of Languages*), born in England in 1834, is a landscape-painter and an author. He has spent much of his life in Paris and made a study of art and of French life and literature. He has attained high distinction as a critic of art, literature, and of social life. Among his numerous works are: "Thoughts about Art," "Etching and Etchers," "Life of Turner," "The Intellectual Life," "Paris in Old and Present Times."

WILLIAM PAGE ANDREWS (*Reformatory Prisons as Schools of Crime*) was born in Framingham, Mass., November 22, 1848. He was educated in Salem, where he has always resided, and since 1870 has been clerk of the Criminal Court there. He has edited the poems of Jones Very and Charles T. Brooks, and has written a good deal for periodical literature on literary and economic subjects.

RICHARD LYNCH GARNER (*The Speech of Monkeys*) was born in Virginia in 1848. At sixteen he joined the Confederate Army and served until the end of the war. In 1865 he entered school at Jefferson Institute, Blountville, Tenn., and remained there until 1867, when he travelled in Kentucky and the South, teaching and lecturing. He devoted much time to a search for the origin of writing, and afterward to an attempt to discover a solution of the temple glyphs from the ruins of Palenque, which he still hopes to find. He also became interested in the phonation of animals, and of late has been studying the sounds produced by monkeys and translating them into human speech. He is soon to go to Africa in order to continue this work.

JOHN N. IRWIN (*Is Iowa a Doubtful State?*) was born in Ohio about forty-five years ago. After graduating from Dartmouth College he went into business in Keokuk, Ia., where he has since taken an active part in Republican politics. He was made Territorial Governor of Idaho by President Arthur, has been Mayor of Keokuk, and is now Governor of Arizona.

EDMUND R. SPEARMAN (*The Burial Monopoly of Paris*) is a resident of Paris. He has been devoting himself for some time past to the study of the social institutions of the French capital. The subject which he treats in this number was investigated specially for the FORUM. He is enabled to conduct his studies under exceptionally advantageous conditions through the close relations which he enjoys with the Parisian city officials. He is a contributor to English and American magazines.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED